ABSTRACT

The advent of web 2.0 has enabled new forms of collaboration centred upon user-generated content, however, mobile social media is enabling a new wave of social collaboration. Mobile devices have disrupted and re-invented traditional media markets and distribution: iTunes, Google Play and Amazon now dominate music industry distribution channels, Twitter has reinvented journalism practice, ebooks and ibooks are disrupting book publishing, while television and movie industry are disrupted by iTunes, Netflix, YouTube, and Vimeo. In this context the authors critique the changes brought about in a case study of film and television higher education from initial explorations of student-generated mobile movie production to subsequent facilitation of international student mobile media co-production teams supported by the development of an international Community of Practice, illustrating new forms of post-web 2.0 pedagogy.
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INTRODUCTION

Over the past four years the teaching of a higher education Film and Television course has undergone significant transformation as the lecturers have attempted to engage with the impact of mobile devices and new forms of media distribution on the industry. This journey has also led to significant pedagogical transformation, as the lecturers have undergone conceptual shifts in the understanding of their roles and the roles of their students in a post-web 2.0 world. The post-web 2.0 era is not web 3.0, the proposed semantic web (Berners-Lee, Hendler & Las-sila, 2001) that is a web driven by artificial intelligence accessed through desktop or laptop computers. Rather the future of the internet is characterized by mobility and the emergence of mobile social media, augmented reality, and technologies such as voice recognition on smartphones and wearable computing. This change of focus away from Internet-connected
desktop computing to ubiquitously connected mobile devices has been heralded by information and technology (IT) commentators such as Jackson (2012):

Social companies born since 2010 have a very different view of the world. These companies – and Instagram is the most topical example at the moment – view the mobile smartphone as the primary (and oftentimes exclusive) platform for their application. They don’t even think of launching via a web site. They assume, over time, people will use their mobile applications almost entirely instead of websites. We will never have Web 3.0, because the Web’s dead. (Jackson, 2012, p1)

Jackson (2012) postulates that web 2.0 companies (founded from 2002 to 2009) such as Google and Facebook may fade into irrelevance in a post-web 2.0 world unless these companies can make the conceptual shifts that a mobile-focused world brings. This post-web 2.0 world is characterized by in situ (contextual) real-time sharing and collaboration, enabled by today’s powerful mobile smartphones. It is a world where Internet use is mobile-first or even mobile-only. Mobile broadband subscriptions out-numbered wired Internet connections in 2010 (Acharya & Teltscher, 2010), the iPhone became the most popular camera used to upload photos to Flickr during 2010 (MobileFuture, 2010), and tablets such as the iPad or Kindle Fire have become a popular medium of choice for reading and media viewing. This shift is illustrated by two significant incidents in 2012:

- Facebook’s disappointing share price decline after its entrance to the stock market in 2012. Facebook’s flagging IPO share prices have been attributed to its weakness in mobile (Gustin, 2012; Miller, 2012). Facebook has embarked upon a mobile buying spree trying to bolster its mobile presence, such as the acquisition of Instagram;
- During 2012 President Obama made a call for all US Government services to be mobile enabled within a year, and is quoted as saying “Americans deserve a government that works for them anytime, anywhere, and on any device” (Melvin & Bull, 2012, p. 1).

This paper recounts the transformational journey that the lecturers and researcher have been on in forming a Community of Practice (COP) for reinventing a Film and Television course in response to a mobile post-web 2.0 world. Key to this has been the changes implemented within an elective course on emerging technologies, that began with a mobile technology focus, but have now moved from enabling student-generated content on mobile devices to enabling collaborative design of authentic international student co-production teams. This change has been paralleled by a pedagogical shift from teacher-directed content (instructivist pedagogy) to student-negotiated and student-directed heutagogy as well as collaborative learning. Not only has the teaching paradigm been transformed, but the curriculum design process has also undergone a transformation from a course written for delivery by a sole lecturer to the co-creation of a collaborative curriculum by an international community of practice of expert lecturers. This transformation echoes Laurillard’s (2012) call for teaching to become a collaborative design science:

A 21st century education system needs teachers who work collaboratively to design effective and innovative teaching, and digital technologies are the key to making that work. Teaching is now a design science. Like other design professionals - architects, engineers, town planners, programmers – teachers have to work out creative and evidence-based ways of improving what they do. (Laurillard, 2012)

Heutagogy

New approaches to collaborative design of education such as that called for by Laurillard require new pedagogies. Curriculum design in
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