

Abu-Lughod's perspective on emotions is different from the other authors. She also used a more personal study approach, as she basically became one of the people she was studying. Her ideas are more valid because she is not implying on how we should behave, but is more focused on presenting the conclusions of her actual study. The other authors off course were also studying cultures in person, but I didn't get the feeling, that they were as engaged as she was with the people. For instance Seligmans study is made as a class, focused on people of his own culture and can therefore be inaccurate for other cultures. The anger texts were also focused on different cultures, but the scholars were not as engaged with people as Lughod was. The best proof for that is her own finding that her host was trying to make her stay with emotionally exaggerated story about a cassette. She did not know that he was lying to her before he dropped her on the airport, but she found out about it later, when she came back and his wife told her, that the girl who was supposed to be dead was actually still married to the guy. That is why I think that her study of emotions is better than those of other authors. Firstly because she did not examine her own culture and secondly because she actually became a solid member of the examined culture.