STATION 1

Who is making the claim?

Should we trust research into the effects of fizzy drinks that has been funded by Coca-Cola but carried out by a third party?

Maria Nestle says, “no scientist should accept funding from Coca-Cola.” Do you agree?

Are there other factors regarding who has made a scientific claim that should we take into consideration when assessing whether evidence is trustworthy? For example, should we only trust research from well renowned universities?

STATION 2

What is the evidence for the claim?

What is the conclusion reached by the ‘Mood state effects of chocolate’ study?

Does the headline of the Fox News article accurately represent the findings of the research?

\* \* \*

Are you surprised by the Nature report?  
  
Should we trust a result that can’t be reproduced?  
   
\* \* \*

What makes good evidence?

STATION 3

How does the claim fit with established science?

Why do you think other researchers are ‘cautious’ about this result?

If the result stands further scrutiny, should we reject the fundamental law of modern physics, that nothing travels faster than the speed of light?

Should this result be scrutinised more than one that doesn’t challenge established science?