


Functional Stupidity in Higher Education. A Concrete Case

José de Jesús Chávez 

Departamento de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, Universidad Autónoma de Occidente Unidad Regional Culiacán, Culiacán 80054, México

Corresponding Author Email: jojchama@gmail.com



Copyright: ©2024 The authors. This article is published by IETA and is licensed under the CC BY 4.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

https://doi.org/10.18280/mmc_d.451-404

ABSTRACT

Received: 28 September 2024

Revised: 30 October 2024

Accepted: 15 November 2024

Available online: 31 December 2024

Keywords:

functional stupidity, university, academic activities, learning, students' proposals

This paper describes a controversial concept, but it is an option for organizational analysis. The objective is to know some Communication Sciences degree students' perceptions about learning dynamics in the classroom and other activities, since their concern is related to activities that do not obtain the pedagogical objective; that's why the decision to use a qualitative strategy based on the application of interviews (group discussion technique) was taken. The results show a students' discontent caused by institutional compliance more towards the forms than the substance.

1. INTRODUCTION

First, it's necessary to comment on "stupidity" term a little bit. According to Porto and Merino [1], the Latin term "stupidus" can be translated as "stunned", and "stupidity" expresses a stunning condition. It can be said that stupidity inhibits clear thinking.

Functional stupidity is a concept that has been used in recent years to define uncertainty and complexity in organizations, since these are entities that are formed according to certain guidelines and objectives. Organizations then operate under certain conditions and human and material factors that are interrelated, and this scenario can lead to planification accomplishment without setbacks, but also imponderables may not to be contemplated.

This conceptual proposal is explained here with the help of literature and could be contrasted with "organizational intelligence" concept or "learning organizations" notion, where idealization turns knowledge into an element of organizational competitiveness.

Despite containing the word "stupidity," which is crude and offensive in the everyday social scenario, this is a conceptual, analytical, and suggestive proposal to detect contradictions that organizations present.

According to Sánchez [2], we can examine the Functional Stupidity decrees: doubts, critical thoughts, and reflexiveness are constrained, and employees try to concentrate on positive aspects promoted by organizations, excluding any kind of criticism. So, personnel try not to get involved in organizational controversies.

The focus of this work is directed towards higher education, specifically in a Mexican university, located in the northwest of the country, with school and extracurricular activities, concretized in lessons, conferences and events in class, based more on instrumental rationality in the Communication

Sciences major. The aim is to know the point of view of the students and relate these perceptions to functional stupidity. Because the identity of this institution will be kept, it is referred to from here on as the "University".

The objective is to exemplify with this case the functional stupidity effectively practiced in educational organizations, supported with students' testimonies, obtained through semi-structured interviews and focus groups on a random sample.

2. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Organizations of all kinds are created with the purpose of fulfilling a social objective or goal, according to the field in which they are inserted, whether public or private. The definition of organization was glimpsed centuries ago, by Richard, who asserted that organizations are designed "to do something" [3]. An organization is "a collectivity oriented toward the pursuit of relatively specific goals and exhibiting a relatively and highly formalized social structure" [4].

This high level of organizational formalization is what makes the subjectivities of the employees emerge, who may or may not internalize the formalisms of each organizational entity and its normative culture due to their culture and the environmental elements.

Spilzinger [5] states that "organizations created by man in his image and similarity, with the aim of fulfilling certain objectives, are certainly complex entities and therefore with a quasi-biological existence." This author recognizes that organizations are made up of individuals as indivisible beings, with different responses to the various problems. It can be said, based on the above, that each member will come up with a way to face difficulties.

According to Alvesson and Spicer [6] functional stupidity

helps to maintain organizational order, but it can also help people to cultivate their careers and subordinate them to socially accepted forms of management and leadership. It should be noted that “stupidity” in the vision of these authors is not addressed as a mental deficiency, but as an epistemological deficiency.

According to Karimi-Ghartemani, there are circumstances in which intelligent people pretend to be stupid due to the dominant culture of the company [7].

In effect, organization agents receive official information and take one of two paths for execution: strict efficiency, based on Taylorism scientific management and on instrumental rationality, and the critical construction, grounded on constructed learning.

The concept of instrumental rationality is closely linked to limited rationality theory, notably developed by Herbert Simon. “As Davis argues (1996), Simon’s concept of rationality is equivalent to efficiency, so organizational rationality is economic efficiency. An efficient individual is someone ‘that attempts rationally to maximize the attainment of certain ends with the use of scarce means’” [8]. As Hortal discusses in a paper, Herbert Simon attempts to describe and explain all the factors involved in rationality, especially those mental factors connected with the environment. Rationality originates in economics and procedural rationality in psychology [8].

According to Díaz Rodríguez and Perez Lucho [9], “The advantage of instrumental rationality is based on its easy understanding and because it is simple and utilitarian”. It should be noted that it is easily understood in practice, of course; that is, the employee or member of the organization is imbued with elements that are easily identifiable and operational.

Thus, “Instrumental rationality demands that decision-making agents use the necessary means to achieve the objectives they intend to attain in their lives, taking all possible alternatives, beyond the exact origin of these and what truly motivates them” [10].

Instrumental rationality can be used tacitly to motivate workers; however, the problem of organizations and their bureaucratic tasks lies precisely in unconsciousness and/or acceptance. Merino [11] argues:

“...many organizations do not trust in the responsibility of their employees. Basically, because responsible people tend to think for themselves and not be docile. Collective reflection, asking questions instead of ordering and making decisions in a thoughtful manner takes much longer and slows down organizations. And being slow in a very dynamic environment is not a formula that many companies like. Unfortunately, this formula of immediacy brings very negative consequences in the long term”.

Merino questions the commitment of companies to give a “SMART”, creative and innovative image, instead of helping people to do their jobs well, which exposes society increasingly to collective “idiocy”.

The opposite case is constructed knowledge: “Since knowledge is socialized, it is concretized and objectified, but it is also mixed with the diversity of meanings that are implicit in subjectivity” and “the organizational learning process is a wide path, with multiple physiognomies and complicated social dimensions, which is not reduced to a single phenomenon” [12]. This idea differs from what could be called mechanical learning, which seeks the execution of tasks to maintain the survival of the company or organization; in the

words of the administration, Nieves explains, “organizational knowledge is a factor of production, which serves to create value more effectively and innovate to be competitive” [12].

Contrary to Taylor, Lladó and Goienetxea [13] establish, in a controversial way, that there must be people in organizations with time to do nothing as their unique responsibility. “They should limit themselves to being there, seeing what is happening. Otherwise, there will be no one thinking”. These observers would have the objective of detecting the failures in the processes and thinking about how to improve them. Thinking is the key, according to these authors.

In short, there are two opposing visions: on the one hand, the predominant classic vision, an instrumentalist, mechanistic and efficiency-oriented model that focuses on the means and not on the goals; this paradigm tends to employ highly qualified professionals to carry out bureaucratic tasks of limited value, for the sake of a triumphalist, albeit monotonous, image. And, on the other hand, there is a paradigm focused on personal and organizational achievement that makes emphasis on the creation and appropriation of knowledge, by reflective and thinking employees.

In the field of higher education, both models also come together: on the one hand, the university/company, which aims to be a technical and scientific support to satisfy the needs of the productive sectors; and, on the other hand, the open, dynamic, critical, comprehensive university, with a democratization of knowledge and a social function above the economic proposal. One is a breeding ground for bureaucratic and productive personnel and the other tends to take more responsibility for the graduates to train them with a social integration and attention to collective problems perspective through reflection and universal knowledge.

2.1 Functional stupidity in higher education

The corporatization of universities is in line with what González Casanova [14] comments in general terms regarding the weakening of the developmental nation-state, especially in the third world, which has an unpayable external debt and has no choice but to abide by the neoliberal guidelines of its creditors, the international economic organizations such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund or the Inter-American Development Bank. “The new university emerged with new types of teaching, research and diffusion that are functional to the existing order, or because they perfect their techniques as science, or because they legitimize it as humanism” [14].

And it seems that some universities are not alarmed or at least not overly affected by this context full of inequalities. Rather, they adhere to the general guidelines regarding the training (“production”) of qualified productive forces to satisfy the demands of the business sector, and as regards research, they design internal policies for the development of projects linked to business interests and the productive environment. Technological innovation projects and market studies are privileged.

Functional stupidity helps to maintain and strengthen organizational order, but it can also help people cultivate their careers and subordinate them to socially accepted forms of management and leadership. It is worth noting that Alvesson doesn’t consider “stupidity” as a mental deficiency, but as an epistemological deficiency.

At another point, Alvesson and Spicer [15] state the following: “Sheer thoughtlessness is an important marker of

common stupidity. Thoughtless individuals do not consider why they are doing something. They remain oblivious to the consequences. When disaster strikes, thought does not ensue”.

Many changes are being made in universities, and almost no one knows why. Books have been practically eliminated as a source of information for students, later they were replaced by scientific articles (in databases) which in turn have been displaced by knowledge spread on social networks. And that seems to be fine for everyone. Teachers have been infected by this trend, and the task of bureaucratized teaching consists of ignoring theories and deep reasoning, moving towards superficial lessons in the classroom.

According to Alvesson, universities are guided more by their image in society. A successful school produces successful graduates: “everyone tries to get prestigious degrees, even if they have little practical validity” ... “Higher education can make a person more intelligent, give him (her) higher tastes or improve his intellectual interests, but fundamentally it is a field in which the goal is to outdo others”, said the Swedish academic [16].

Alvesson also emphasizes the impact of technologies, as symbolic capital, on the contrasting status of academia:

“...the first person to have a mobile phone, who may have been a clumsy and simple person, became from that moment on a star in the eyes of other people... It is an ideal target for symbolic capital, especially if we compare it with other more relevant forms of prestige but also more difficult to achieve, such as training, erudition, professional competence or positive contribution to the lives of other persons” [16].

Many students, as it observed, are seduced too much by technologies, and they want to know and listen to someone experts in social networks. So, the University organizes conferences with any “erudite” in this area.

3. METHODOLOGY

Universities are immersed in a social dynamic that includes three substantive functions: teaching, research and the dissemination of culture. Depending on the case, some institutions focus more on one function than the others. Those universities that want to grow must attend to the weakest function. The University has had a significant increase in enrollment, so it has attempted to maximize the students' instruction; however, many of the decisions have been made by complying with an image, rather than by a positive impact.

Therefore, this qualitative study focuses on the response of twenty students, a sample of interviewed informants, enrolled in the communication sciences degree, regarding their opinion about activities in the classroom and outside of it.

The students were selected due to their interest in those academic activities. They used to chat to each other mainly about conferences, so a wider discussion in a systematized way was proposed to them. In this sense, a discussion group was organized. According to Izcarra Palacios [17], a discussion group is a working group that produces discourses, and it is integrated by persons with specific characteristics for discussing around a subject. Their testimonies formed four categories of analysis: “classes”, “courses (or seminars)”, “conferences,” and “organization of the curriculum”. Added to these is another category which emerged during the group discussions: “lack of infrastructure”.

It should be noted that, as Butler points out [18], Alvesson and Spicer have no empirical evidence to support their claims

about functional stupidity. That’s true. It seems they express personal appreciations and informal observations about some cases. However, Max Weber did something similar when he outlined his model (ideal type) for analyzing bureaucracy. Functional stupidity concept could be a methodological tool to understand and analyze organizational decisions and actions, especially those detected and criticized by major university students.

To sum up, there are no empirical studies about functional stupidity in organizations, but someone can start at any moment. This paper tries to initiate, basically because there is observed evidence.

4. FINDINGS

The communication students at the University expressed their impressions about how the course is run, the shortcomings in infrastructure and the organization of the curricular content, as well as the teaching of classes. They also put forward interesting proposals for the improvement of these factors in various ways.

This section includes only the most significant statements from informants, since the oral testimonies obtained are abundant.

4.1 Classes and activities outside the classroom

The research findings indicate that in everyday classes, some teachers organize attractive and artistic presentations, such as choreography, singing, dramatizations and the use of costumes, and, on the other hand, more formal presentations with the help of computers and projectors.

Three students said they felt like they were “making an ass of themselves” by dancing and singing, but one of them said that “I would do anything for a 10 (the higher note)”. It should be noted that these students have a calm nature and very good academic performance. Other students indicated that it is preferable to develop these dances and songs than to take written or oral exams.

In terms of classes, they ask for classes with history and management of social media subjects, not only in terms of interrelation but also in a promotional sense, that is, inserting videos and reels from commercial companies or institutions. However, they say there is only one professor in the entire university who subdues these aspects. They state that, for example, many people use Facebook and TikTok, but they do not know how to fully use them because those social networks change constantly. They point out that “many people got into” the degree “because they want to be influencers and want to know some things.” They also propose taking a subject on digital editing throughout the degree, from the beginning to the end.

The importance of digital technology for this and all cases is an important element:

“The transformation to a more integrated and digital-based system is proven to increase effectiveness in various services or dimensions involved in higher education such as teaching, administration, finance, curriculum, human resources, and information. The application of digital technology facilitates a more engaging and interactive learning experience” [19].

Another aspect of the classes is related to visits to companies in the communications sector (mainly media). The University usually makes an annual trip to visit other cities in

Mexico or in the locality. In this regard, a student comments:

“Something that always affect our generation a lot is that they (the University) don't take us to any place, they don't take us to see how a television program is made, they don't take us to the radio, they don't take us to anything that was supposed to be related to a (media) practice”.

Another student commented that her group has not been taken to visit the recently opened cultural channel, owned by the University, and that instead the school authorities take students from other schools to get to know the TV channel facilities. This television station is supposed to be for the students' training, but it is located very far from the campus and special transportation must be paid for. This channel operates exclusively as a broadcaster with cultural programs for the public; that is good, but it is not enough.

4.2 Courses

The most requested by the students interviewed are complementary courses and seminars that reinforce their communication training. At the University, the courses are usually part of conferences for the degree program. In the case of communication sciences degree, the courses do not satisfy the students' requirements and concerns. One schoolgirl said that most of these events are very focused on organizational communication. Another pupil said that the conferences organized by the graphic design degree contain better seminars and conferences because “it contains a lot of production for reels, photography, there is a lot of creativity and innovation for networks and dissemination that the communication sciences committee itself do not have.”

4.3 Conferences

In the communication sciences program, the lectures and talks offered to students are also not satisfactory in the opinion of those interviewed. Five students complained, claiming that conferences “have no level” in subjects such as entrepreneurship and organizational communication, since the speakers do not address methods or strategies and focus mainly on their personal achievements. They refer that a guest expert in events organization (weddings) started an informal talk and did not explain the systematization of his work process.

Here are some other opinions on this subject:

- “Some conferences do have an interesting topic. The problem is the people who are brought to give the conference because they are not prepared, or they are called at the last minute. I feel that they only bring the groups to “make up the crowd” and not so much for the learning that the conference could contain. It is simply to fill the auditorium”.
- “It is common for them (the University) to bring former students or professionals who graduated from the communications degree, from some degree here, and you can see how their conference is linked to ‘oh, I had a great time, I was very good here, the teachers are very good’. Yes, but we don't care if the teachers are very good, what matters to us is that you, as a speaker, tell us what the job market is like and how we can have tools to be able to face that job market that you are experiencing”.
- “I don't need just graduated people to come, I need

people with experience in many things and can give us advice about job camp or about the mistakes they made so we don't make them”.

- “The speakers come and talk about themselves, always saying ‘I did this, I did that’, instead of talking about their work or their work talking about them”.

It should be noted that there was an opportunity to attend a conference by a speaker who would talk about his doctoral research project, however he devoted most of his presentation to his activity as an influencer in the field of video games.

4.4 Organization of curriculum matrix and infrastructural lacks

This subject emerged from the group of discussion, and it is important and interesting because in the last three semesters of the degree (sixth, seventh and eighth) students are relocated according to their preferred area of emphasis: design and production of digital content, journalism and organizational communication. The functionaries of the University social sciences department, according to the interviewed students, privilege the area of organizational communication by devoting more events to it and even visits to companies. The orientation in this area is entrepreneurship and business management to provide employment for others. Organizational communication students joke saying that they will give work to their fellow students in journalism and digital production areas. Always joke about that point. However, one student said that more than that is needed: a more global and binding vision is needed in the three areas of concentration, anchored in the teaching of public relationships.

A student comments: “Who teaches you public relations here, and who teaches you how to relate to others? I think public relations could be taught in organizational communication, but we are not going to learn it as such and I think it is a subject that should always be there, from the beginning”.

This student exemplifies the above with the arrangements made by his group with a local journalist, Luis Alberto “N”, to lend them his TV studio, since it is well equipped. “And we learned more in that time (recording a program in Luis' TV studio) than we learned in the entire career related to television, and Luis Alberto said ‘yes, I support anyone who comes from the University because I studied there’”. The emphasis on the relationship with external entities to obtain support for learning is therefore evident, in this case a well-equipped TV studio, a TV studio which the University lacks.

5. DISCUSSION

It could be said that the Communications Sciences degree at The University operates with inadequacies in several aspects. The sample of interviewed students resulted in declarations about elements to attend to improve them.

First, the students agree on improving the complementary resources for their training, since the conferences are simply a requirement to be fulfilled, with speakers who contribute little to academic training and do not fully address the topic for which they were invited to speak. The proposal is to invite speakers with more work experience and broader knowledge of the topics, even if they are from universities in other parts of the country.

On the other hand, what is striking is something that could be called a weakening of academic reflection on content, where classroom lessons have been complemented with activities that seek to entertain students so as not to bore them.

Another concern expressed by students is the preparation and theoretical/practical mastery of social networks, a topic that is rarely addressed in the curriculum and there are no teachers who handle this topic, except for one. The proposal is to include this subject throughout the degree, since many companies make extensive use of their social network accounts and Internet pages. So, some classes of three specialty areas need to be improved with an eventual transversal curriculum design. Activities in the classroom must be revised for a more academic formation, and teachers could explain and justify why pupils must dance and sing.

One proposal is that the three areas of concentration interact with each other also around the topic of social networks, since it seems that they are three totally separate and differentiated "sects". In addition, interviewed pupils consider it important to give equal attention to the three fields, since there are marked preferences towards organizational communication.

Finally, the Communication Sciences course at the University is being taught with infrastructural deficiencies, but there is more evidence of an academic implementation with some inconveniences, according to students' opinion. The TV and radio cabins are outdated in terms of equipment and have not been attended to. In addition, the University's television channel serves the purpose of disseminating knowledge, science and culture, but does not function as a training place for its own students.

Here it is worth citing an idea from Alvesson and Spicer [15], who says: "The truth is that university degrees are in decline because many courses lack real academic content and there is a lot of overqualification of students with limited interest and skills". That is functional stupidity. The University contemplates itself as an academic scenario where every activity corresponds to the global requirements of higher education, however it does not think clearly about the real needs of its students. Maybe, as Lladó and Goienetxea point out, the University needs some persons looking (supervising) at the institutional operations and programs to detect anomalies; persons who question to the members of university community about scholar necessities: infrastructure, curriculum, seminars, etc. Persons who may design and propose humanistic, academic and integral solutions. But we must not forget that "most workplaces these days seek to encourage and cultivate critical thinking, reflection and 'out of the box' ideas, yet they often remain better at doing the opposite" [19]. It's important to keep in mind that organizations are complex, but their functioning is also flat; many are still "based on a strict scale, a vertical structure where authority exerts voracious control" and where creativity is undervalued [20]. Therefore, organizations often foster stupidity.

6. CONCLUSIONS

All the above concerns point to an uncertainty in university education. In the case studied, more work is done on the institutional image than on the academic aspect. Reflection and deep thought are left aside, as functional stupidity theory states. The authorities of the University believe that they are fulfilling their mission, but they align themselves with the

requirements imposed by the higher education regulatory bodies in Mexico, which in turn follow the orders of the governing bodies of the world economy. This model is also seen as rigid, since the University takes it as an inflexible model to follow without giving it nuances that also focus on humanistic training and scientific knowledge, which is what really regulates and promotes practice for professional training.

However, the University decided to go for the quick and easy convenience, taking advantage of the "rating" of some lecturers instead of establishing an academic agenda, while some professors decide to undertake other learning strategies to respond the students' aversion to academic reading and assessments through exams. This is an adversity to which there is no conclusive didactic response.

Functional stupidity is an analytical tool that can help overcome rigidities and labels imposed on organizations and higher education institutions, as well as to suggest reflection and analysis about how competent universities are, internally and towards the environment.

If one of the fundamental actors in the equation, the student, reflects on when observes something doubtful in his higher formation, then it is possible to undertake alternative strategies both to detect ambiguities and to address them as far as possible and improve the teaching-learning interaction.

This article aims to provide reflections on a specific case with the help of the concept of functional stupidity, to demonstrate that it is applicable and useful in the analysis of organizations.

REFERENCES

- [1] Porto, J.P., Merino, M. (2022). Estupidez - Qué es, teoría, definición y concepto. Definición. <https://definicion.de/estupidez/>.
- [2] Sánchez, E. (nd.). La Estupidez Funcional revisada a fondo. Abc.Systems - Gestión de Alto Rendimiento. https://www.abcsystems.es/pages/articulos/0026_art-estupidez-funcional-afondo.aspx#:~:text=El%20concepto%20de%20%22Estupidez%20Funcional,%22seguros%22%20estrechos%20y%20preestablecidos.
- [3] Richard, H. (1996). Organizaciones, estructuras, procesos y resultados. Editorial Prentice Hall.
- [4] Scott, W.R. (1981). Organizations: rational, natural and open systems. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- [5] Spilzinger, A. (nd.) Anatomía de la estupidez - La estupidez en las organizaciones. WCSA. <https://wccsalatam.org/laanatomia delaestupidez.html>.
- [6] Alvesson, M., Spicer, A. (2012). A stupidity-based theory of organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(7): 1194-1220. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01072.x>
- [7] Karimi-Ghartemani, S., Khani, N., Esfahani, A.N. (2020). Developing a framework for organizational stupidity. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 31(2): 100392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hitech.2020.100392>
- [8] Hortal, A. (2017). Empiricism in Herbert Simon: Administrative behavior within the evolution of the models of bounded and procedural rationality. *Brazilian Journal of Political Economy*, 37(4): 719-733. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0101-31572017v37n04a04>
- [9] Díaz Rodríguez, M.A., Perez Lucho, Y.A. (2020). La

- racionalidad instrumental como mecanismo de toma de decisiones en la empresa. Bachelor's Thesis, Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas, Peru. <http://hdl.handle.net/10757/652934>.
- [10] Moehler, M. (2014). The scope of instrumental morality. *Philosophical Studies*, 167: 431-451. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-013-0106-x>
- [11] Merino, A. (2016). La estupidez funcional. Álvaro Merino - Activa tu talento. <https://www.alvaromerino.com/la-estupidez-funcional/>.
- [12] Nieves, Á.E.R. (2019). La estupidez expresa en el proceso de aprendizaje organizacional. *Revista Gestión y estrategia*, (56): 23-36. <https://doi.org/10.24275/uam/azc/dcsh/gye/2019n56/Ramirez>
- [13] Lladó, E., Goienetxea, I. (2014). La estupidez de las organizaciones: 7 metáforas para el cambio. España: Rigden Institut Gestalt.
- [14] González Casanova, P. (2001). La universidad necesaria en el siglo XXI. Ediciones Era.
- [15] Alvesson, M., Spicer, A. (2016). The stupidity paradox: The power and pitfalls of functional stupidity at work. London: Profile Books.
- [16] Hernández, E. (2014). "Emptiness", la causa de que haya tanta estupidez en la empresa y en la educación. *El Confidencial*. https://www.elconfidencial.com/alma-corazon-vida/2014-03-31/emptiness-la-causa-de-que-haya-tanta-estupidez-en-la-empresa-y-en-la-educacion_108954/.
- [17] Izcará Palacios, S.P. (2014). Manual de investigación cualitativa. México DF: Fontamara SA.
- [18] Butler, N. (2016). Functional stupidity: A critique. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization*, 16(2): 115-123. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1136903/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- [19] Alvesson, M. (2018). Rated: Grandiosity, and functional stupidity, *The Psychologist*, 31(17).
- [20] Sabater, V. (2019). La "estupidez funcional: La gran demandada en muchas empresas". *La Mente Es Maravillosa*. <https://lamenteesmaravillosa.com/estupidez-funcional-gran-demandada/>.