

A critical conversation simply refers to the ongoing textual conversation among researchers, scholars, and thinkers regarding certain areas of inquiry. It is an exchange of ideas, findings, arguments, and a means of understanding that shape knowledge of areas or fields. It is also crucial in research to enable the researchers to build upon that which already exists, point to the gaps in their findings, refine previous ideas, and even challenge them. By engaging in such dialogues, researchers contextualize their work within a broader context and ensure that their contributions are relevant, informed, and meaningful (3-4).

Kenneth Burke uses the metaphor of a party to help the reader understand critical conversations by illustrating how critical conversations and research function as dynamic, ongoing processes. When you arrive at the party (the conversation), discussions are already underway, with people expressing opinions, debating, and contributing ideas. After listening for a while, you begin to understand the context and join in, building on or contrasting with others' ideas. Even after you leave the party, the conversation continues, in private with your own studies, or in different spaces and cooperating with others (10).

This metaphor highlights key aspects of research: continuity, participation, and its temporal nature. Research is never entirely original; it builds on prior work—in other words, it is continual. Researchers contribute their perspectives and findings to ongoing discussions, and many people participate in these discussions, adding their own findings and hypotheses to it. Finally, research evolves over time as new participants (researchers) join and new discoveries are made; the current subject is fairly temporary as new questions and studies arise, shifting perspectives (11).

Alongside that, genuine inquiry involves a mindset of curiosity, openness, and a willingness to embrace uncertainty. It is driven by the desire to ask meaningful questions and explore the unknown rather than merely confirming preconceived answers or beliefs. Characteristics of genuine inquiry include starting with questions, not answers. Research begins with identifying areas of interest or curiosity, rather than having a predetermined thesis or conclusion that has already been reached and well verified (5).

Researchers must also be open to changing their perspectives, methods, and interpretations as they learn more. Genuine inquiry acknowledges that real research is messy, iterative, and recursive. It requires revisiting and refining questions, methods, and findings, and there is almost always a new niche in previous research to expand upon, sometimes even uprooting information that was well verified. Researchers approach their work with the intention to discover new knowledge, even if it challenges their prior assumptions or understanding. In essence, genuine inquiry is about moving from "not

knowing" to "beginning to know" while remaining curious and reflective throughout the process.

Genuine inquiry challenges my previous research experiences in academia, as most of the work I've done has been researching something someone else had already researched and come to a clear conclusion on. From the beginning, the research I was doing was based on a question that was unoriginal and uninventive, resulting in a bland task with almost no real point other than writing practice.

Previously, I had studied and reported research on human cloning and its real-world practicality and perceived purpose. I have incorporated CARS model moves into it by establishing the territory of research I was covering and directly reviewing the previous items of research and sharing them. Following this was the niche I established in the argument by highlighting a gap in the research that had been done. In context, this was pointing out that the cloning discussed in research was not true "cloning" typically seen in pop culture and was instead more akin to the in vitro raising of a sibling, as the original subject and the cloned subject were never truly the same. It was better used as an assisted child birthing tool. My research ended with the occupation of the new niche I presented via presenting the points discussed again and affirming newly presented questions from this research.

It was only after thoroughly analyzing the article and CARS model that I realized that I had already been given practice with how research works, albeit flawed, and how to utilize the CARS model. Much of this was familiar, but it also affirmed the flawed parts of the assignments I had done in the past and pushed me towards more genuine inquiry.