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Abstract
This research discusses the aspects of action that contain accounts in Death on the Nile movie, based on the theory of Scott and Lyman (1968) on the aspect of excuses and justification. The objective of this research is to describe the types of accounts in Death on the Nile movie. The researcher used descriptive qualitative as this research method. The data sources in this research are divided into two categories, namely movies as primary data and audiovisual as secondary data. Data collection was carried out by downloading movies, watching movies, reading intensively, and selecting data based on the communicative action model. The data was analyzed by presenting, describing, interpreting, and concluding data to answer the research question from this research. The results of the research show that there are 14 data accounts in the Death on the Nile movie. This account occurs because it was created by several characters in the movie who provide excuses and justifications to avoid being accused of the murder incident of a wealthy woman named Linnet. Findings, the researcher found that all justification are excuses, but not all excuses are justifications. In addition, the justification aspect is more dominant used to justify bad behavior, in the excuses aspect the type of appeal to defeasibility can be used to kill the victim, appeal to accident aspect is used to make unexpected events, appeal to biological aspect is the last aspect that causes behavior. There is no scapegoating aspect in this movie.
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INTRODUCTION
Accounts in discourse analysis are a process of how someone gives excuses and justifications for undesirable or unusual behavior, or they may explain unexpected behavior. Accounting is a social process of how people position themselves, especially when things are not wanted in deviant situations, according to Scott and Lyman (1968: 46). These people often use stories or comments to justify or excuse unexpected or unwanted actions. Account types classify the causes and justifications for the behavior.

Giving excuses and justifications for every poor action taken in human life from making excuses to making others the victim is frequently done to protect oneself and lessen the impact of the bad behavior. There are several ways to portray social activity, including through the medium of
movies. A movie is a creative work of art that combines a variety of artistic aspects to satisfy spiritual demands. Therefore, a writer must begin the thinking process as well as a technical process, namely the search for ideas and story concepts, to create a story movie. According to Hornby (2006), a movie is a collection of moving images that have been captured with sound and are displayed in a theater.

This research is important to describe how excuses and justifications are used in this movie, which is related to the types of accounts appeal to accidents, appeal to defeasibility, appeal to biological drives, and appeal to scapegoating what are described in Death on the Nile movie, which is based on Scott and Lyman's (1968) theory and to help the audience of this movie, the thesis readers. This is in the future, especially in increasing understanding of how to use accounts in the movie Death on the Nile, because the account actions of the characters in the movie are closely related to discourse analysis, namely how someone gives certain reasons to justify his actions and avoid the impact others make.

The researcher discovers that there were several prior studies related to the account in this research, "Justification, Excuse, and Explanation: A Pragmatic Perspective" by Hasson & Saffah (2017), this previous research advocates that justification and excuse are interrelated speech acts that have tons in common inside the sense that dreams are frequently distracting and most effective contextual clues that allows to distinguish one from the alternative. Besides autobiography analysis in Accounts in "Adopting The Black Radical Perspective: An Analysis of Autobiographical Accounts" by Brown (2020), who examines autobiographical accounts of Black radical activists considering such a worldview. By recounting their experiences with racism, Black radicals change their political meaning from extreme and irrational to reasonable and acceptable. From previous research, the researcher wants to complete the previous research using the same account theory, but in this research, the researcher completes the types of accounts that have not been analyzed in the movie and focuses on Scott and Lyman's account theory. Therefore, the researcher decides to see how accounts are used in the Death on the Nile movie.

Based on the description above, the rationale is that it is still rarely used in the context of linguistic research, especially research in the field of discourse. The researcher chooses Death on the Nile movie as the unit of analysis in this study rather than choosing another unit of analysis,
because the researcher finds many account aspects that were more dominant in this movie than Marshall movie, Just Mercy movie, and Denial movie. After comparing the three movies, but in Death on the Nile movie, the researcher finds more types of accounts in this movie than Marshall movie, Just Mercy movie, and Denial movie. The second is that this movie has never been studied from an accounting perspective. And the last one is because the researcher is more familiar with Scott and Lyman's account theory.

The researcher also finds the interesting things in the movie Death on the Nile. In which there were characters in Death on the Nile movie who were used to deny on the grounds that they did not know what had happened, by giving excuses or justifications for unusual events or even characters who could reason that their actions were caused by other characters. These reasons turned out to have motives and meanings that must be explained more deeply in the analysis of this research.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research used descriptive qualitative research to describe data analysis in the form of information from the narrative. This is connected to the features of the research in discussing the usage of accounts in the movie Death on the Nile, along with the kinds based on Scott and Lyman's (1968: 46) theory. Qualitative research is the form of data in the form of sentences or narrative obtained through qualitative data collection techniques. According to Cresswell (1994), qualitative research is a way to understand social or human problems that is focused on sophisticated, holistic image formation using words, relaying particular perspectives from informants, and the use of natural settings. Therefore, the researcher used a qualitative approach because the data and research question models are descriptive.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the researcher presents the research results on how his account described excuses and justification in Death on the Nile movie. Which is based on Scott and Lyman’s theory, where the researcher described the findings which will then explain the meaning of the findings as in the point below.
Account in Death on the Nile Movie

The purpose of this section is to present the results and discuss the research findings regarding the actions of account aspects in the characters. It aims to answer the research question in chapter 1. In analyzing the data, the researcher used the account theory by Scott and Lyman (1968). Based on the research, the researcher identifies and classifies two types of account aspects performed by the character in this movie. The source of data in this research is Death on the Nile Movie and analyzed using the theory of account in terms of justification and excuses.

Appeal to Defeasibility

Data 1

Hercule poirot: Someone is dead, Linnet Doyle
Ms Bowers: Linnet? stop what do you mean? how?
Hercule poirot: I am afraid Jacqueline de Bellefort has made good on her threat.
Ms Bowers: No, that's impossible, I was with her all night.
Hercule poirot: Did you leave her side to sleep at all?
Ms Bowers: No, not a minute. Not a wink. And even if I had, I was scared she might hurt herself, so I gave her enough morphia to feel like an elephant.

Bowers was the first to be questioned because she was the nurse who was with Miss Bellefort where Bellefort was the main suspect in the murder incident because she had a personal grudge against Linnet because Linnet had stolen her boyfriend. Bowers denied the charge because he thought Miss Bellefort could not have killed Linnet because at the time of the murder, Bellefort was sleeping with him.

The dialogue above describes Bowers as a nurse caring for Miss Bellefort, who is the main charge in Linet's murder. At the time when the murder incident occurred Hercule Poirot as a detective came to see Bowers in a hurry to allege that Miss Bellefort had succeeded in killing Linnet. Even Bowers, who was shocked by the incident of Linnet's death, immediately gave an excuse that the accusations that Hercule had leveled at Miss Bellefort were untrue. Bowers stated that Miss Bellefort would not do that because she spent the night accompanying Miss Bellefort to bed and injecting her with anesthetist because she was afraid that Bellefort would wake up and injure herself. By saying, “No, not a minute. No blink of an eye. And even if I did, I was afraid he would hurt himself, so I gave him enough morphine to knock an elephant over.”
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Bowers' conversation above contains elements of an account of excuses for the type of appeal to defeasibility, because of Bowers' thoughts, Bellefort could not have killed Linnet that night while Bellefort was unconscious because Bowers had injected Bellefort with an anesthetic.

Data 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hercule poirot</th>
<th>Louise</th>
<th>Hercule Poirot</th>
<th>Louise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>: What did you do last night after you left Miss Linet?</td>
<td>: I went to my cabin on the deck below.</td>
<td>: did you go anywhere else? See or hear anything else?</td>
<td>: forgive me, sir. If I had come outside my cabin to smoke. I might have seen her killer enter or leave her cabin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: But you did not or you did? What is this?</td>
<td>: Uh, no, I… I did. I did have a cigarette inside. You all are staring at me. It's making me... please. You know we kept our confidence. I was childish at times, but that's all. Tell them, I would never hurt Miss Linet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the incident where Hercule questioned Louise about the missing necklace, Hercule returned to see Louise asking about what she was doing after leaving Linnet's room the night before the murder incident.

From the dialogue above Louise explains that after leaving Linnet she went to her room to smoke, she explains if she smokes outside the room she might be able to see who the killer is. but Hercule keeps accusing Louise that she did it. Because of this accusation, Louise tried to explain by giving reasons that she couldn't have killed Miss Linnet because she was a maid who had been with Linnet for years, so Louise denied it by saying “Uh, no, I… I did. I did have a cigarette inside. You all are staring at me. It's making me... please. You know we kept confidence. I was childish at times, but that's all. Tell them, I would never hurt Miss Linet. “

Louise's conversation above contains an element of account excuses of the type of appeal to defeasibility, because the reasons put forward by Louise are quite strong and appropriate in terms of an appeal to defeasibility element.

Data 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hercule Poirot</th>
<th>Dr. Windlesham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>: there are less powerful pain medications in your bag which would suffice. You created for yourself an opportunity.</td>
<td>: I didn’t create an opportunity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Hercule Poirot: *Linnet was unkind, no?* she flaunted her new love, yet still called you like the puppy dog. Seeing them pained you, and like the strong opiate injection, you could end your pain with a bullet.

Dr. Windlesham: *What do you want me to say? What do you want me to say? That I know I'm ridiculous? I'm not a fool, I knew she was settling for me. I didn't mind, when she married Simon, I actually thought about ending my own life. They all thought our engagement was for the families, the papers, for the damn aristocratic theatrics of it all. I loved her.*

Dr. Windlesham is also suspected of having killed Linnet because before Linnet married Simon, Dr. Windlesham was Linnet's fiancé. After Linnet married Simon, Linnet canceled all her marriage plans with Dr. Windlesham.

From the dialogue above, Hercule suspects Dr. Windlesham, because Dr. Windlesham could have killed Linnet because of his disappointment and hurt towards Linnet for thwarting their wedding plans. Dr. Windlesham, who did not accept being accused of being Linnet's killer, confirmed by saying “*What do you want me to say? What do you want me to say? That I know I'm ridiculous? I'm not a fool, I knew she was settling for me. I didn't mind, when she married Simon, I actually thought about ending my own life. They all thought our engagement was for the families, the papers, for the damn aristocratic theatrics of it all. I loved her.*”

The conversation contains elements of an account excuses of the type of appeal to defeasibility, as in the sentence above, Dr. Windlesham made it clear that he would not do that although when he heard the news about Linnet and Simon's marriage he was very disappointed he could not have killed the one he loved. For the reasons stated by Dr. Windlesham is quite strong and worthy of an element of appeal to defeasibility.

**Data 4**

Hercule Poirot: *and the contracts you wished her to sign, they are very important?*
Andrew: *yes. They are. Were. With Linnet gone, the, uh, estate will have to be redrawn.*

Hercule Poirot: *May I see them?*
Andrew: *Forgive me, these are confidential. I must insist*
Andrew: *you think I killed her?*
Hercule Poirot: *Did you kill her?*
Andrew: *I don’t benefit a dime from her death, Mr. Poirot. You can look at the will I revised. A good mother stands to inherit. Her husband legally gets the rest. You won’t see my name anywhere.*
Andrew, Linnet's cousin, is also on the list of people suspected of having killed Linnet because Linnet's death could have benefited greatly from Linnet's inheritance.

From the conversation above Hercule alleged that Andrew killed Linnet, because according to Hercule's death Linnet, Andrew could have benefited from Linnet's inheritance. But Andrew disagreed with Hercule's opinion about that, so Andrew defended himself and emphasized by saying "I don't benefit a dime from her death, Mr. Poirot. You can look at the will I revised. A good mother stands to inherit. Her husband legally gets the rest. You won't see my name anywhere."

Andrew's conversation above contains an element of account excuses of the type of appeal to defeasibility, because in the sentence above, Andrew emphasized that he did not kill Linnet, even though it happened he did not benefit from Linnet's death at all. Because the reasons put forward by Andrew are quite strong and appropriate in terms of an appeal to the defeasibility element.

Data 5

Linnet Mother: You are meant to be finding the killer of my goddaughter. I never had children of my own. I had Linnet.

Hercule Poirot: You are aware, of course, that you are a key beneficiary in Linnet.

Linnet mother: You accuse me now of murder?

Bouc: Oh, no, he accuses everywhere of murder

Hercule Poirot: It is a problem, I admit

Linnet Mother: that I would kill my own goddaughter for money? I already gave away a fortune. I don't give a fig for money. I see no reason to continue this conversation. Come on Bowers.

The next suspect was Linnet's godmother or Linnet's mother who had cared for Linnet since childhood. She was accused of being Linnet's killer because, from Linnet's death, she gained a big advantage, namely an inheritance.

The conversation above explains where Hercule said that from Linnet's death, it was Linnet's mother who benefited the most. Linnet's mother was shocked by Hercule's words accusing her of being the murderer of her own child. Linnet's mother also said “would I kill my own goddaughter for money? I already gave away a fortune. I don't give a fig for money. I see no reason to continue this conversation.”
Linnet's conversation above contains an element of account excuses of the type of appeal to defeasibility, because the reasons put forward by Mrs. Linnet were quite strong and appropriate in terms of an appeal to defeasibility element.

**Data 6**

Hercule Poirot: *there was one final question. It is a curiosity of mine. Your hat, in the turban style. As many times as I have seen you, you have always worn one like I, but it is out of fashion, no?*

*Waiter*: *not when I wear it.*

Hercule Poirot: *If you would indulge me, please, remove it.*

*Waiter*: *oh!! It's all right, he's driving at an answer he already knows.*

Hercule Poirot: *22 caliber, like one that killed Linnet.*

*Waiter*: *I've used it, if you wanna ask. Twice in defense, once in anger. Last night was not that once. Tell me if I'm lying.*

The next suspect that is Hercule's target is the waiter, where Hercule is curious about the turban that is always attached to the butler's head. Hercule asked the waiter to take off her turban and when she did, he found a weapon like the one used to kill Linnet.

The conversation above explains Hercule being curious about the turban that the waiters often use, even though the turban style used according to Hercule is outdated. Hercule also asked the waiter to remove the turban and when it was released there was a 22-caliber weapon like the one used to kill Linnet. the waiter who knew Hercule's intention immediately gave an excuse by saying *"I've used it if you wanna ask. Twice in defense, once in anger. Last night was not that once. Tell me if I'm lying"*

The waiter's conversation above contains an element of account excuses of the type of appeal to defeasibility, because in the sentence above, the waiter said that she used the weapon to protect herself and emphasized that it was not her who killed Linnet that night. Because the reasons put forward by Mrs. Linnet were quite strong and appropriate in terms of an appeal to the defeasibility element.

_Appeal to Accident_

**Data 7**

Hercule poirot: *Was there a single moment, when mademoiselle de bellefort left your sight?*
Rosalie: *Never no*

Hercule poirot: *So Bellefort couldn’t have murdered Linnet? just as she could not have pushed a boulder onto Simon Doyle. What did you do after bringing her to Bowers?*

Rosalie: *We came back here to pick up the gun and lock it away. I kicked it under the couch. But when we came back, we couldn’t find it.*

Rosalie is the second, where before the murder incident occurred there was an incident where Miss Bellefort had a fight with Linnet's husband named Simon who was her ex-boyfriend. During an altercation, Bellefort fires a bullet at Simon's leg. At the time of the incident Rosalie was there to break up the fight and finally Rosalie brought Bellefort to her room.

In the dialogue above Hercule asks about what Rosalie did after taking Miss Bellefort to Bowers. Rosalie explains to Hercule at the time of the incident, she took Bellefort to her room to cool off and was accompanied by Bowers who was a nurse. After that she returned to the place where Simon was injured to get the gun that Bellefort used when she shot Simon, but the gun was gone. Hercule suspects that Rosalie could have killed Linnet because when Linnet's body was found she had a gunshot wound to her head. Rosalie confirmed to Hercule by saying “*we came back here to pick up the gun and lock it away. I kicked it under the couch. But when we came back, we couldn't find it.*”

Rosalie's conversation contains an element of account excuses for the type of appeal to accident, because of the reasons that Rosalie gave about the missing gun, it was an incident that often happened and these lost incidents were more likely to be accepted as excuses.

**Data 8**

Hercule poirot: *So, did you see the necklace when you came in this morning?*

Louise: *Alors, I saw Miss Linnet there. Dead. I dropped the tray and ran out.*

Hercule Poirot: *What did she mean earlier on the way to Abu Simbel, when she said the trip to Egypt was your idea? For your own honeymoon.*

Louise: ummmm

Louise was the third murder suspect because she was a maid who was always with Linnet and took care of all of Linnet's needs. Louise was also suspected because she was the first to find Linnet lifeless with a gunshot wound to the head. During the dialogue during the investigation, Hercule saw that the necklace that Linnet used to wear was missing and that the person responsible for the necklace was Louise. Where Louise was responsible for all of Linnet's needs.
when Hercule asked her if the moment she found Linnet lifeless did she see the necklace that morning, Louise replied by giving an excuse “Alors, I saw Miss Linnet there. Dead. I dropped the tray and ran out.”

Louise's conversation contains an element of account excuses for the type of appeal to accident, because the reason Louise gave about her only seeing Linnet die and dropping the tray of food and running out to ask for help, is an incident that often occurs is more likely to be accepted as an excuse.

**Data 9**

Hercule Poirot : *why did you not wake Linnet when Simon was shot?*

Bouc : *poirot, don’t.*

Hercule Poirot : *her husband was shot, you have such sympathy for the former fiancé of Louise. You wish to inform him of her fate. Yet, you do not spare the same sympathy for Linnet.*

Bouc : *I thought she would be asleep. She said that she had taken a sleeping pill.*

Bouc, who is Hercules's confidant, becomes the next suspect. Hercule suspects that it could be Bouc who killed Linnet. because there was an incident where during the night of the murders, Simon was shot and Bouc went to Linnet's room. The conversation above explains where Hercule asked why when Simon was shot, Bouc didn't wake Linnet from his sleep. The suddenly questioned and cornered Bouc simply said no, but Hercule again said that Bouc had no sympathy for Linnet. Bouc confirmed by saying “I thought she would be asleep. She said that she had taken a sleeping pill.” The Bouc conversation contains an element of account excuses of the type of appeal to accident, because of the reasons Bouc has given about why he didn't wake Linnet during the incident Simon was shot, with the reason Linnet was sleeping and she had taken sleeping pills, is a reason that will be rejected because it is based on an incident that cannot be investigated and more likely to be accepted as excuses.

**Data 10**

Hercule Poirot : *it was stolen By Linnet Doyle’s murderer. By her husband Simon Doyle.*

Simon : *me? That’s ridiculous*  
Dr Windlesham : *how could he? He was shot.*
Hercule Poirot: *Yes, he was shot. We know this for certain. What we do not know for certain is when he was shot, or what he did in the moments after we believed that he was.*

Simon: *you are mad. That I would shoot myself.*

Simon, who is the husband of Linnet, becomes a suspect in the murder of his own wife, Linnet. The conversation above explains where Hercule alleged that Linnet's killer was Linnet's own husband, Simon. Simon, who heard the accusation from Hercule, felt it was very absurd, how could he kill his wife when he was shot in the leg too, Simon's statement was agreed by Dr. Windlesham. But Hercule returned to provide a more detailed explanation of the results of his investigation, saying that Simon actually shot himself in the leg. From the results of Hercule's investigation, Simon still opposed what Hercule said was unreasonable. Simon also gave a rebuttal by saying “you are mad. That I would shoot myself.”

Simon's conversation contains an element of account excuses of the type of appeal to accident, because from the sentence above, Simon emphasized that he couldn't have done that and he couldn't have shot his own leg. The reason given by Simon is quite strong and appropriate in the element of an appeal to accident because the form of reason that Simon put forward is a possible reason that will be rejected if it is based on incidents that cannot be observed or investigated.

**Appeal to Biological**

**Data 11**

Hercule Poirot: *Cousin Andrew, doing as he did at the temple of abu simbel, where he wandered off alone, desperate. When he saw an opportunity. Hoping to hide his sins under a rock, he pushes one.*

Andrew: *I.. I don't know what I was thinking. I wasn't... I wasn't thinking, I saw them below and.. and thank god I missed. And you must all know..i didn’t kill her. I would never do that. I loved her. I didn’t kill her.*

Hercule Poirot: *no, he did not.*

During their trip down the Nile, the cruise ship they were traveling on had stopped at a place called the Abu Simbel temple. While at the Abu Simbel temple, Andrew wanders around the temple feeling broken because of Linnet’s decision to marry Simon.

The conversation above explains the results of Hercule’s investigation to Andrew. According to the results of Hercule’s investigation, Andrew was walking around the temple with feelings of
despair. Andrew saw that Simon and Linnet were kissing below, which made his feelings unclear. Andrew also saw that there was an opportunity to drop a rock, because Andrew’s mind, which was in a bad state, finally Andrew dropped a large rock towards Simon and Linnet. Andrew also said “I... I don't know what I was thinking. I wasn’t... I wasn’t thinking, I saw them below and... and thank god I missed. And you must all know. I didn't kill her. I would never do that. I loved her. I didn’t kill her.”

Andrew’s conversation contains an element of excuses of the type of appeal to biology, where an appeal to biology is a human biological urge that influences or causes other people to escape responsibility. Because from the conversation Andrew said that when he did this, he also did not know what he had done. Where the behavior is oneself which is called an appeal to biological excuses.

Justification

Data 12

Linnet Mother : You are meant to be finding the killer of my goddaughter. I never had children of my own. I had Linnet.
Hercule Poirot : You are aware, of course, that you are a key beneficiary in Linnet.
Linnet mother : You accuse me now of murder?
Bouc : Oh, no, he accuses everywhere of murder
Hercule Poirot : It is a problem, I admit

When Hercule was talking casually with Miss Bowers, Linnet's godmother came to them suddenly saying that Hercule as the detective in charge of this murder case must immediately find the killer of her child.

But from the conversation above Hercule started to accuse Linnet's mother, that Linnet's mother could have killed her own daughter for money because Linnet's death was the one who benefited the most. As the argument was going on Bouc came in their midst saying that Hercule not only accused her of being a murderer, but Hercule accused everyone involved with Linnet. And Hercule acknowledged this by saying "It is a problem, I admit."

Hercule's conversation contains elements of account justification, because from that conversation, Hercule confirmed what Bouc said about him accusing everyone of being a murderer.
Data 13

Hercule Poirot: Cousin Andrew, doing as he did at the temple of Abu Simbel, where he wandered off alone, desperate. When he saw an opportunity. Hoping to hide his sins under a rock, he pushes one.

Andrew: I don't know what I was thinking. I wasn't... I wasn't thinking, I saw them below and... and thank god I missed. And you must all know... I didn't kill her. I would never do that. I loved her. I didn't kill her.

Hercule Poirot: no, he did not.

While traveling along the Nile, the cruise ship they were traveling on had stopped at a place called the Abu Simbel temple. There Andrew toured the temple, disillusioned by Linnet's decision to marry Simon.

The above conversation describes Hercule accusing Andrew of being Linnet's killer again. According to Hercule's point of view where Andrew was walking around the temple in despair. Andrew saw below that Simon and Linnet were kissing because his feelings were not good, Andrew saw that there was an opportunity to drop a large rock. Andrew, who heard this, admitted that he had indeed dropped large rocks toward Linnet and Simon but not by killing them by saying "I... I don't know what I was thinking. I wasn't... I wasn't thinking, I saw them below and... and thank god I missed. And you must all know... I didn't kill her. I would never do that. I loved her. I didn't kill her."

Andrew's conversation contains an element of account justification, because from the conversation Andrew confirmed what Hercule said about him dropping a large rock to Linnet and Simon.

Data 14

Hercule Poirot: Bellefort, his lover once. His lover still. Introducing the couple. Stalking them. Finding them aboard this ship. Shooting Simon with a blank. All to create two unassailable alibis. The grieving husband left to inherit his wife's fortune and then, in time, to marry the woman he loves. I have always loved it. When I asked Louise if she had anything, she gave a curious answer. "If I had come outside my cabin, I might have seen the killer." Not yes, not no, but a veiled threat to Linnet's killer, who was present in the room. Simon Doyle who then assured her that Louise would be taken care of indeed, she
was. As soon as he was able, Simon, no doubt, sent a message to Bellefort warning her of the new danger.

Bellefort: you can't all believe him. He has no proof.
Hercule Poirot: True. I have only a sunken gun wiped of fingerprints, yes. But it came with a gift. The handkerchief. The warm waters of the Nile in springtime would set the color of blood to a dull brown. In those same mysterious waters, carmine red paint will fade to pink.

Bellefort: oh, how clever is Hercule Poirot
Hercule Poirot: Was the ambition his or yours?

Where was when Hercule gathered everyone and explained in detail the results of his investigation, that the one who compiled the murder plan was Simon's ex-girlfriend, Bellefort, and who killed Linnet was her own husband, Simon.

The conversation above explains the results of Hercule's investigation, which explains all the events starting with Bellefort creating events to create alibis starting from shooting Simon in the leg with blank bullets and making plans with Simon to kill Linnet. All that Bellefort has done is to get her and Simon to take over Linnet's estate and get married. At first, Bellefort did not agree that what Hercule said was incorrect because he did not have more evidence, but Hercule explained again and provided strong evidence of the murder. Finally Bellefort also confirmed what Hercule said by saying "oh, how clever is Hercule Poirot". Bellefort's conversation contains elements of account justification, because of this conversation Bellefort confirmed that she and Simon had planned to kill Linnet.

CONCLUSIONS
Based on the findings and discussion above, a conclusion can be drawn with a research question about "How is Account Described excuses and justification in Death on the Nile movie." In terms of the excuses and justifications that are made by several characters in the movie, the characters use justifications to avoid responsibility for the actions they have taken, where most users of justifications and reasons know directly about the bad actions that have been committed but give a different story and do not in accordance with the facts or the action is carried out because it is forced not because of the wishes of the character himself. And in the form of reasons in the Death on the Nile movie, there are also many characters who use excuses of one type, appeal to accident, which was carried out by a character named Louise, who was the first person to find Linnet lifeless, by saying that she had only seen Linnet died, where the reason Louise gave was an incident that could not be observed or investigated. The act of excuses of the type of appeal to
defeasibility is carried out by the Linnet mother character who gives reasons about her not being able to kill her own child just because of money, where the appeal to defeasibility is a form of argument for the impossibility that can be used as a defense for oneself. And the act of excuses for the type of appeal to biology that is done by Andrew's character where when he drops a rock, Andrew himself is confused about what he has done, where the action that Andrew has done is a human biological urge that influences or causes other people to escape responsibility.

In this research, there is also a point that contains 2 aspects of an account, namely excuses, and justification, this happens because the two aspects are interrelated where a justification can contain excuses, but not all excuses are justifications. So that every action taken by the characters in the Death on the Nile movie can be associated with these two aspects. Based on Scott and Lyman's (1968) account theory.
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