2a.

These are examples of bad GDDs because they are either too basic, or have too much information. They didn’t even have a table of contents, so they were difficult to navigate. There was also some issues I found with spelling errors, and poor grammar. They both seemed longer than they needed to be, as well.

2b.

These are examples of good GGDs, because they are formatted in an easier way i.e. bullets. They used pictures that were helpful-maps/graphics/. They also opened up areas up for discussion on the publisher side of things. I found the table of contents to be helpful as well.

2c.

In these GDDs, The main similarities to modern GGDs are that they still discuss gameplay, title screen description, and solutions to potential issues that may arise. Target age market was missing, along with an ESRB rating(I don’t think that was a thing then). Similar games on the market were also not present. The pattern/ organization seems to be corrected my hand afterwards. Also, it appears that in Pole position, there is a lot of chatting back in fourth in the form of memos.