
Subject: Re: Do You Like E.A. Games?. I Think.
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 14:13:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

They've been putting out poorer and poorer quality products for a while now. I couldn't prove anything, but I'm fairly sure that EA also has a few of the major reviewers (IGN being suspect #1) on the payroll. Reviews of EA games I've played in the past 4-5 years have consistently not matched up with the actual quality of the product; major glitches like the BF2 jump/damage exploit don't get mentioned, nor do things like poor netcode, excessively long load times, or frequent crashing. There are only really two explanations for those sort of consistent oversights: A- The reviewers just don't play the games as thoroughly as they should, or B- The reviewers are asked very nicely not to mention nasty things about EA-produced software. Seeing as how other games that are poorly coded or just blow goats get pretty accurate and fair reviews while even EA's shittiest sports game repeats and Sims expansions get above 7/10, I tend to lean towards the latter.

Not that EA's special in that- movie studios do it all the time- but it's something to take into consideration when wondering why EA continues to sell lots of games that aren't as good as they used to be. Also bear in mind that we're in the minority- most people who play games don't ever communicate with other gamers via forums like these. Most of EA's customers are impulse buyers who see ads or pretty boxes and don't look any deeper; even those that read reviews first aren't nearly as likely to report poor quality control to as many other gamers as we are. I'm sure that a lot of them just think that shitty games are an industry-wide phenomenon and that they won't find better elsewhere, which with a few notable exceptions is sadly becoming the case.

Whatever you may think of EA's practices, there are a few facts which just cannot be denied:

1. EA games have consistently shown poorer quality control for several years now, as evidenced by glaringly obvious bugs that couldn't possibly have been missed in a thorough beta (as with the aforementioned jump/damage exploit in BF2).
2. EA games are frequently just re-hashed clones of previously released EA games, i.e. BF2-2142 and ALL of their licensed sports titles.
3. EA expansion packs barely deserve the name- the prime example here is The Sims, whose expansions consist of a few new items and similar eye-candy for a full-expansion price of \$30 or more.
4. Despite all of the above, the lion's share of EA titles consistently receive reviews above 70% and continue to sell millions of copies each year.
5. EA shows consistent disregard for community input and favors quick-fix patches rather than permanent, reliable solutions- as in the last C&C3 patch, which altered gameplay aspects (namely the use and placement of power plants) which have long been the cornerstone of tactics in the series rather than addressing the issue beneath the surface (shit builds too damned fast). Their original "fix" for BF2's jump/damage exploit was equally laughable; rather than remove the glitch that allowed jumping players to be immune to damage, they changed it so players could no longer fire weapons while jumping.

Diagnosis, hmm?
