

Assessment 4 Confirmation

Falsificationism and Bayesianism offer competing accounts of confirmation—that is, of how evidence supports hypotheses. Each account also offers a way to solve or to avoid Hume’s problem of induction, either by showing that scientific reasoning does not involve induction (falsificationism) or by explaining how we might have reason to believe that scientific evidence supports some scientific hypotheses better than others (Bayesianism). But which account offers a better interpretation of the role of inductive reasoning in scientific practice?

Describe both the falsificationist and Bayesian accounts of confirmation, as well as the differences between these accounts. Then, for each account, provide an exposition of how it purports to avoid or to solve the problem of induction. Finally, assess which of the two accounts better explains the role of inductive reasoning in scientific practice.

