



Systematic Review

Gendered Ageing and Expert Authority: A Forensic-Psychological Review of Credibility, Attribution and Professional Legitimacy.

Name of Author: Dr. Seema Sutay.	Abstract: Background: Professional authority in forensic and medico-legal work depends not only on technical competence but also on how expertise, confidence, communication and credibility are perceived. Age may strengthen expertise and seniority, while gendered expectations may alter the interpretation of authority. This review examines gendered ageing through the specific lens of expert credibility, behavioural attribution and professional legitimacy. Methods: A structured multidisciplinary review informed by scoping-review principles integrated evidence from workplace ageism, gender and leadership, menopause-at-work, expert-witness credibility, forensic workforce research, technological change and Indian workplace contexts. Results: The evidence does not support a uniform disadvantage model. Accumulated experience can increase judgement, confidence and expert authority, yet equivalent professional behaviour may acquire different meanings according to gender and age. Experimental work on leadership and expert witnesses demonstrates context-dependent differences in evaluations of assertiveness, anger, warmth, qualifications and credibility. Menopause is best separated into a functional pathway, in which symptoms may require workplace support, and an attributional pathway, in which known or assumed menopausal status may influence interpretations of behaviour. Conclusions: Gendered professional ageing is best understood as an interaction between accumulated professional capital and the social interpretation of authority. Research should test whether increasing experience confers equivalent credibility benefits across gender and identify conditions under which attributional bias interrupts the conversion of expertise into professional legitimacy.
Affiliation: Professor and Head, Department of Forensic Medicine & Toxicology, Nandkumarsingh Chouhan Government Medical College, Khandwa, Madhya Pradesh	
Corresponding Author: Dr. Seema Sutay. Email Id: seemassutay@gmail.com	
Received: 10-08-2026 Revised: 24-08-2026 Accepted: 04-09-2026 Published: 07-09-2026	Keywords: gendered ageism; expert credibility; professional authority; forensic psychology; expert witness; forensic medicine; behavioural attribution; menopause; India; professional legitimacy.
This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).	

INTRODUCTION

Ageing at work is not solely a biological or chronological process. It is also a social process shaped by expectations regarding competence, authority, productivity, appearance and future value. Ageism encompasses stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination based on age and can intersect with gender. [1] For senior professionals, however, the issue is not only whether age creates disadvantage. It is whether accumulated experience is translated into recognised authority.

This question is especially relevant to women. Professional ageing may increase expertise, institutional knowledge and confidence while gendered expectations continue to influence how decisiveness, firmness and disagreement are perceived. Role congruity theory proposes that prejudice can arise when expectations attached to women conflict with expectations attached to leadership; the same agentic behaviour required for authority may therefore carry different interpersonal costs when displayed by women. [2] Contemporary work on middle- and older-age women likewise shows that ageing can operate both as constraint and as

resource rather than producing a uniform pattern of decline. [3]

The present review narrows this broader literature to a forensic-psychological problem: when professional experience increases with age, does recognised expert authority increase equivalently across gender? The focus is on behavioural attribution—how observers explain firmness, criticism, boundary-setting, anger, confidence and resistance to inappropriate pressure—and on the consequences of those interpretations for credibility and professional legitimacy. The issue becomes particularly important in forensic medicine, forensic laboratories and expert testimony, where the authority of the professional affects how scientific information is received in institutional and legal settings.

Menopause is included because it overlaps with years of substantial professional responsibility for many women. A crucial distinction is made between functional effects, in which symptoms may genuinely affect work and require support, and attributional effects, in which known or assumed menopausal status may become an explanation for otherwise ordinary professional behaviour. The second pathway remains less directly studied and should not be assumed without evidence.

This framing deliberately avoids a deficit model. Ageing can coincide with slower adaptation to some novel tasks or changing health needs, but it can also bring richer pattern recognition, stronger contextual judgement, greater independence and more calibrated decision-making. In high-stakes expert work, speed is only one component of performance. Accuracy, restraint, awareness of uncertainty and the ability to recognise misleading evidence may improve with experience. The relevant comparison is therefore not youth versus age in the abstract, but the match between demonstrated capabilities and the demands of the professional task.

Review Approach

This manuscript is a structured multidisciplinary review informed by scoping-review principles. The Population–Concept–Context framework was used to organise literature concerning women in middle and later working life, gendered ageing, professional authority, behavioural attribution, menopause, expert credibility, technological relevance and forensic or medico-legal practice. Evidence was drawn from organisational psychology, occupational health, gender studies, gerontology, leadership research, expert-witness literature, forensic workforce research and authoritative institutional sources.

Targeted searches combined terms relating to women or gender, ageing or midlife, professional authority, leadership, assertiveness, anger, credibility, expert witnesses, menopause, forensic medicine, forensic

science, India and digital or AI-related competence. Peer-reviewed empirical studies, major reviews and authoritative reports were prioritised. Because the evidence base is heterogeneous in design and outcome, findings were synthesised narratively rather than statistically pooled. Particular attention was given to contradictory findings and to evidence that age may strengthen rather than diminish expertise or authority.

No participants or primary data were involved. Database export files, screening logs and numerical flow counts were not retained prospectively; the manuscript is therefore reported as a structured multidisciplinary review informed by scoping principles rather than as a fully PRISMA-ScR-compliant scoping review.

Professional Authority, Gender and Attribution

Professional authority requires more than occupying a formal position. A designation can confer the right to decide, correct or refuse, but socially recognised authority depends on whether others accept the legitimacy of that behaviour. This distinction is central to gendered professional ageing because seniority often increases the need to exercise precisely those behaviours—criticism, boundary-setting, disciplinary action and disagreement—that are vulnerable to interpersonal evaluation.

Leadership research provides a well-developed foundation for this argument. Agentic behaviour such as confidence, dominance and assertiveness is conventionally associated with leadership, whereas women have historically been expected to display greater warmth and communality. [2] Rudman and Glick demonstrated backlash toward agentic women when they were perceived as insufficiently ‘nice’, even when agency was relevant to managerial performance. [4] Research on negotiation similarly suggests that women may incur interpersonal penalties for strong self-advocacy while insufficient assertion can carry a competence cost. [5] The resulting problem is not simply whether a woman is competent, but whether observers approve of how she exercises power.

Anger offers particularly clear evidence of attributional asymmetry. Brescoll and Uhlmann found that angry male professionals received greater status than comparable female professionals, and observers were more likely to attribute men’s anger to external circumstances while explaining women’s anger through internal characteristics. Providing an external explanation reduced the gender difference. [6] Marshburn and colleagues likewise found that anger could increase perceived competence while women still experienced status penalties. [7] These findings show why competence and interpersonal approval should not be treated as the same judgement.

Context can modify such effects. Block and colleagues

reported that an existing relationship could buffer female leaders against some consequences of anger by encouraging external rather than dispositional explanations. [8] This has relevance to ageing: long professional histories may provide contextual knowledge and reputational capital that protect an established woman from simplistic attribution. Conversely, a highly experienced woman entering a new institution may possess expertise without the local history that helps others interpret her behaviour.

Age itself can operate in opposite directions. It may legitimise authority through experience and seniority, but it may also activate stereotypes of rigidity, reduced adaptability or interpersonal inflexibility. Chatman and colleagues found an age–gender pattern in which middle-aged professional women remained perceived as agentic while receiving lower warmth evaluations as younger women. [9] Thus, ageing may increase the objective basis for authority while simultaneously changing expectations about how that authority should be expressed.

The evidence does not justify assuming that every negative evaluation of a senior woman is biased. Firmness can genuinely become rigidity and anger can genuinely become inappropriate. The scientific question is comparative: when behaviour, qualifications and context are held equivalent, are causes, competence and legitimacy inferred differently according to age and gender? Direct studies of age × gender × authoritative behaviour remain much thinner than the broader literatures on ageism or gender backlash.

A further implication concerns the distinction between evaluation of outcome and evaluation of style. A senior professional may reach a technically correct decision and still be criticised for being abrupt, difficult or insufficiently collaborative. Such criticism is not necessarily illegitimate: professional authority includes obligations of proportionality and respectful communication. However, when style judgements become the main route through which otherwise sound authority is discounted, gendered expectations may become especially influential. This is why studies should record both competence-related judgements and interpersonal judgements rather than collapsing them into a single global credibility score.

Menopause: Functional Effect versus Attributional Interpretation

Menopause commonly overlaps with a stage at which women have accumulated substantial professional knowledge and responsibility. It should therefore not be framed as occupational decline. Symptoms such as sleep disturbance, fatigue, vasomotor symptoms or cognitive complaints may affect work for some women, but severity and occupational consequences vary greatly according to individual and workplace conditions. An Indian study of employed menopausal women reported

associations between greater symptom burden, poorer work ability and reduced quality of life, particularly in more physically demanding or low-autonomy work. [10]

The forensic-psychological issue is different from symptom burden. Disclosure can enable support, yet it can also make menopausal status available as an explanatory label. Recent qualitative syntheses describe effects on professional identity, self-trust, workplace belonging, fear of judgement and pressure to perform. [11,12] These findings support attention to stigma, but they do not establish that colleagues routinely attribute authoritative behaviour to menopause.

For conceptual clarity, two pathways should therefore remain separate. The functional pathway is: symptoms → possible work difficulty → appropriate occupational support. The attributional pathway is: known or assumed menopausal status → stereotype activation → possible reinterpretation of behaviour or competence. A firm disagreement might be professionally justified regardless of menopausal status; labelling it ‘menopausal irritability’ without evidence converts a biological category into a causal explanation for professional behaviour. The provisional idea of menopause attribution bias is therefore best treated as a testable hypothesis rather than a validated construct.

This distinction has practical value. Supportive menopause policy should address genuine needs without encouraging colleagues or institutions to treat menopause as a presumption of emotional instability or declining competence. In expert settings, where credibility depends heavily on perceived judgement and composure, the cost of such attribution could extend beyond wellbeing to professional legitimacy.

The distinction is also important for ethical communication. Organisations should avoid two extremes: minimising symptoms because menopause is normal, and over-medicalising ordinary disagreement, fatigue or performance variation once menopausal status is known. Both approaches can undermine autonomy. A proportionate response assesses the actual functional problem, the demands of the role and the support requested by the individual, while keeping unrelated professional judgements anchored to evidence.

Professional Capital, Visibility and Technological Credibility

Ageing professionals accumulate what may be termed professional capital: expertise, tacit knowledge, institutional memory, reputation and networks. Yet professional capital is not identical to professional currency—the extent to which that expertise is perceived as relevant to contemporary practice. Older workers may be respected for experience while simultaneously being overlooked for training or future-

oriented assignments. OECD analyses have highlighted age differences in adult learning and advanced digital skill use, while also emphasising the role of opportunity, cohort effects and employer investment rather than intrinsic inability to learn. [13]

This distinction is particularly important in rapidly changing expert fields. Digital platforms, automation and artificial intelligence increasingly function not only as tools but as symbols of adaptability. An experienced professional who has had limited access to new systems may be interpreted as technologically outdated even when the limitation reflects institutional opportunity rather than capability. Research and policy discussions on older workers and AI similarly emphasise that successful AI use depends on judgement, communication and domain expertise as well as technical familiarity. [14]

Professional visibility is another component of legitimacy. A senior woman can retain designation and salary while receiving fewer strategic assignments, training opportunities, external representations or invitations into future-oriented projects. Such marginalisation may not appear in conventional employment statistics. In forensic and medico-legal environments, reduced visibility can influence who becomes the institutional spokesperson, who gains access to newer technologies and whose expertise is repeatedly placed before courts or investigative agencies.

Visibility matters because repeated exposure can itself build credibility. Professionals who are invited to chair committees, lead difficult cases, present externally or adopt new methods accumulate further opportunities to demonstrate competence. If access to those opportunities becomes age- or gender-patterned, later differences in reputation may reflect cumulative opportunity rather than intrinsic performance. This possibility is particularly relevant when organisations interpret a thinner recent portfolio as evidence that an older professional is less current, without examining whether developmental opportunities were distributed equally.

Expert Credibility and Legal Decision-Making

Expert testimony provides an unusually clear setting in which professional authority becomes observable. Experts are expected to be knowledgeable, independent, understandable and sufficiently confident to withstand challenge. Yet credibility is not a direct reading of technical competence; it is a social judgement shaped by qualifications, communication, demeanour and contextual cues.

Neal's review of women as expert witnesses concluded that gender effects are not uniform and are often moderated by characteristics such as expertise, topic, communication and context. [15] Experimental work by

Neal and colleagues has shown that warmth and competence can jointly shape the perceived credibility of male and female experts. [16] Larson and Brodsky found that assertive versus defensive response styles interacted with expert gender in ways relevant to credibility evaluation. [17] These findings are important because effective expert testimony often requires confident disagreement under cross-examination.

The courtroom therefore reproduces a familiar double demand. An expert who appears hesitant may be perceived as less authoritative; an expert who appears overly combative may be perceived as less impartial or less likeable. If the acceptable behavioural corridor differs by gender, women may need to calibrate confidence and warmth more narrowly. O'Brien's analysis of expert authority in courts further illustrates that expertise is negotiated socially rather than simply possessed. [18]

Presentation cues can also affect source credibility.

Jones and colleagues demonstrated that attire, cosmetics and posture altered perceptions of women expert witnesses, showing that evaluations can incorporate cues unrelated to substantive expertise. [19] More recent work comparing male and female psychologist and psychiatrist expert witnesses likewise indicates that perceived bias and credibility can depend on context rather than following a simple gender disadvantage model. [20]

These studies do not establish that older women experts are systematically disbelieved. Direct age-by-gender evidence in expert-witness settings remains limited. They do, however, establish the plausibility of the core mechanism: expert credibility is partly constructed through social perception, and gender can influence that construction under some conditions. Age may then modify the same process by increasing presumed experience while simultaneously activating expectations about warmth, adaptability, appearance or retirement.

For forensic psychology, the consequence is significant. A stereotype affecting an ordinary workplace interaction may influence one employee; a stereotype affecting the perceived credibility of an expert can influence how scientific evidence is understood in a legal proceeding. Group-level research should never be used to infer bias in a particular case, but it can identify conditions under which credibility judgements deserve closer empirical scrutiny.

Expert-witness research also illustrates why high qualifications do not eliminate all room for social interpretation. Credentials can provide a strong baseline of legitimacy, but the expert must still communicate conclusions, acknowledge limitations and respond to challenge in real time. The credibility judgement is therefore dynamic. It can be strengthened by clarity and composure or weakened by overstatement,

defensiveness and apparent partiality. For ageing women, the important empirical question is whether long experience provides the same presumptive credibility that it may provide to older men, or whether women remain more dependent on moment-to-moment demonstrations of warmth, restraint or approachability. Current evidence is insufficient to answer this directly, which makes the question appropriate for experimental rather than rhetorical treatment.

Forensic Medicine, Forensic Laboratories and Medico-Legal Practice

Forensic medicine offers a particularly strong application because expert judgement is exercised under legal scrutiny. Forensic physicians interpret injuries, conduct postmortem examinations, preserve evidence, formulate opinions and testify in court. Experience can improve pattern recognition, appreciation of uncertainty, resistance to premature conclusions and understanding of how findings may be challenged. Ageing in such work may therefore increase rather than diminish professional value.

At the same time, forensic practice is physically and psychologically demanding. Workload, exposure to death and violence, court responsibilities, biological hazards and organisational constraints can affect wellbeing across the career span. National Institute of Justice work has documented productivity and occupational-stress concerns in forensic science, while more recent forensic-pathology literature continues to examine burnout, resilience and quality of work. [21,22] These issues should be assessed as occupational conditions rather than automatically interpreted through age or gender.

Forensic laboratories add technological dependence. Toxicology, DNA analysis, digital forensics, spectroscopy, chromatography and AI-assisted systems require continuing education. A senior scientist may possess superior interpretive judgement while being less familiar with a newly introduced platform; a younger scientist may master an interface quickly while lacking the older expert's experience with artefacts, contamination or evidentiary limitations. The strongest laboratory therefore combines technological fluency with accumulated judgement rather than treating them as competing generations of expertise.

AI intensifies this problem. Guidance for forensic service providers increasingly addresses applications, limitations and governance of AI. [23] If new technologies are allocated preferentially to younger staff because they are presumed to be more adaptable, opportunity differences may later be misread as ability differences. Conversely, seniority should not become a shield against necessary retraining. Expert legitimacy depends on both accumulated experience and demonstrable currency with validated methods.

AI also changes the meaning of expertise. Generative and analytic systems can accelerate retrieval, pattern detection and documentation, but they do not remove the need for domain knowledge, validation and accountability. In forensic settings, an experienced expert may be especially valuable in recognising when an automated output is plausible but evidentially unsafe. Conversely, reliance on experience without engagement with validated new tools can become a genuine limitation. The appropriate standard is therefore current, demonstrable competence rather than age-coded assumptions about either technological fluency or wisdom.

Courtroom work makes the interpersonal dimension visible. A forensic expert must explain uncertainty, defend methodology and sometimes resist pressure from investigators, lawyers or institutional superiors. These are authority behaviours. A senior woman who answers firmly may be evaluated simultaneously for competence, warmth, confidence and perceived emotionality. The relevant question is not whether women should be less assertive, but whether equivalent professional firmness receives equivalent interpretation.

This leads to a practical forensic model. Experience can produce expertise, judgement and credibility; gender- and age-related stereotypes can alter the interpretation of communication; organisational resources and technological opportunity determine whether expertise remains current; and the resulting credibility affects institutional and courtroom legitimacy. The pathway is therefore neither purely individual nor purely structural. It is an interaction between capacity, opportunity and social interpretation.

Forensic work is also distinctive because errors of interpretation can have consequences beyond the professional relationship. An expert opinion may influence investigation strategy, charging decisions, judicial understanding or the weight accorded to scientific findings. Accordingly, institutional cultures should be alert to two opposite risks: under-valuing experienced professionals because of assumptions about age or gender, and over-valuing seniority to the point that outdated practice escapes scrutiny. Age-inclusive professionalism requires neither deference nor dismissal. It requires evidence-based evaluation of current competence, transparent quality assurance and equitable access to continuing professional development.

Indian Context and the Seniority–Authority Question

India provides an important context because many expert professions operate within strong hierarchies, formal seniority systems and rapidly changing technological environments. Forensic medicine departments are commonly embedded in government medical colleges and public hospitals, while forensic

laboratories interact with police, judiciary and administrative structures. Seniority may confer substantial formal respect, yet gender may still influence the social acceptance of directive or disciplinary behaviour.

This creates a testable seniority–authority question: can cultural respect for seniority coexist with unequal acceptance of female authority? An older woman may hold a senior designation and be formally respected while still needing to justify decisions more extensively, soften criticism or repeatedly demonstrate legitimacy. Direct Indian evidence integrating age, gender, authority and forensic credibility remains limited, so this should be treated as a research hypothesis rather than a national characteristic.

Such a paradox would be especially important in professions where hierarchy is explicit. Formal respect may suppress overt challenge while leaving subtler forms of resistance visible in delayed compliance, repeated requests for justification, interpersonal labelling or exclusion from informal influence. These outcomes are harder to capture than promotion or salary and may require mixed-methods assessment. Equally, some senior women may experience strong protection from exactly the same hierarchy. Studying both possibilities is essential to avoid constructing older professional women only as victims.

The Indian context also includes major variation in institutional resources and technological access. A senior forensic professional in a resource-constrained setting should not be classified as technologically obsolete because advanced platforms were unavailable locally. Capability and opportunity must be separated. Broader gender data also show why women's professional trajectories cannot be interpreted independently of structural differences in employment and opportunity. [24] Indian menopause guidance further reinforces the need to address health appropriately without reducing women's professional identity to menopausal status. [25]

The public-sector context may make this especially interesting. Formal rules can preserve designation, salary and seniority even when informal influence changes. A woman may therefore appear protected from discrimination in administrative data while experiencing greater resistance to her instructions, fewer invitations to influential discussions or reduced access to emerging technical opportunities. Conversely, formal hierarchy may also protect experienced women by making authority less negotiable. The direction of effect is therefore an empirical question, not a presumption. Multi-centre Indian research across medical colleges, FSLs, universities and other professional settings could clarify when seniority functions as a resource and when it fails to convert into socially recognised authority.

Integrated Forensic-Psychological Interpretation

The literature supports a model in which professional ageing has two simultaneous pathways. The resource pathway begins with age and accumulated experience, producing expertise, judgement, professional reputation and potentially greater authority. The risk pathway begins when age- and gender-related expectations alter the attribution of behaviour, producing reduced legitimacy, visibility or opportunity despite preserved competence. The same individual may experience both pathways at once.

Attribution is the bridge between them. Observers do not respond only to what an expert does; they infer why the expert did it. Firmness can be interpreted as principled authority or unnecessary aggression. Caution can be interpreted as evidentiary discipline or resistance to change. Visible frustration can be interpreted as situational or dispositional. A request for training can be interpreted as professional updating or proof of technological inadequacy. The central question is therefore whether demographic information changes explanation when the behaviour itself is equivalent.

Three distinctions are especially important. First, competence is not the same as likeability or warmth. Second, formal authority is not the same as socially recognised authority. Third, functional change is not the same as interpretive change. Conflating these constructs can make bias difficult to identify and can also lead researchers to label legitimate performance concerns as discrimination. A rigorous approach requires controlled comparisons, appropriate behavioural anchors and independent measures of competence, credibility, authority legitimacy and negative attribution.

The framework also explains why professional capital may be protective but not sufficient. Strong credentials and long reputation can reduce ambiguity and strengthen credibility, yet accumulated expertise can lose organisational currency if access to new technology, training or influential assignments declines. Positive professional ageing therefore depends not only on the individual maintaining skills but on institutions continuing to provide opportunities to convert experience into contemporary contribution.

The model also accommodates positive professional ageing. With experience, many professionals become better able to tolerate disagreement, communicate uncertainty and resist inappropriate pressure. They may be less dependent on universal approval and more capable of mentoring others. In expert practice, these are genuine assets. A framework centred only on discrimination would miss this developmental gain, while a framework centred only on seniority would miss the possibility that accumulated expertise is unevenly recognised. The most useful formulation is therefore a balance between professional resources and

interpretive constraints, moderated by organisational culture, reputation, technological opportunity and the transparency of performance criteria.

Research Priorities and Implications

The most important empirical gap is the shortage of direct age $\times$ gender studies of authoritative professional behaviour. Future experiments should hold qualifications, role, behaviour and context constant while varying age and gender cues. Outcomes should separate competence, credibility, legitimacy of authority, warmth, willingness to follow recommendations and negative behavioural attribution. This would test whether older women receive the same credibility benefit from experience as older men and whether firmness is differently interpreted across age–gender combinations.

Menopause research should similarly distinguish symptoms from attribution. Experimental designs could examine whether identical behaviour is judged differently when menopausal status is disclosed, presumed or absent, while ensuring that the research does not itself reinforce stereotypes. Organisational studies should examine whether support policies improve wellbeing without creating unintended assumptions about emotional or cognitive instability.

Forensic settings deserve specific study. Questions include whether male and female experts derive equivalent credibility gains from seniority; whether older female experts are evaluated differently during assertive cross-examination; whether established reputation buffers gendered attribution; and whether later-career access to AI, instrumentation and advanced training differs by gender. Indian studies should use locally validated measures and account for hierarchy, employment security and resource variation rather than simply importing Western assumptions.

These questions also lend themselves to staged research. Initial qualitative work can identify language actually used to describe senior professionals, including terms such as firm, difficult, rigid, authoritative or approachable. Content-valid measures can then be developed to distinguish credibility from behavioural attribution. Controlled vignette studies can test causal hypotheses, followed by field studies examining whether the same patterns predict consultation, leadership opportunity, courtroom confidence or access to advanced training. This sequence would reduce the risk of imposing theoretical labels that do not reflect local professional culture.

The practical implication is not that organisations or courts should discount negative impressions of senior women. It is that professional behaviour should be evaluated against objective standards and situational evidence rather than demographic shorthand. Health-related support should respond to actual need;

technological competence should be assessed rather than inferred from age; and expert credibility should remain anchored to qualifications, methodology, reasoning, transparency and performance.

Methodologically, vignette-based factorial studies are particularly well suited to this problem because they can hold the professional act constant while varying demographic cues. A scenario in which an expert refuses to approve a deficient report, challenges an unsupported conclusion or responds firmly under cross-examination can be presented with identical wording across conditions. Ratings can then distinguish competence, trustworthiness, legitimacy of authority, professionalism, warmth, perceived aggression, willingness to rely on the expert and perceived emotionality. Such designs would allow researchers to test attributional differences without assuming them in advance and could be adapted for Indian forensic and healthcare settings after cultural validation.

Strengths and Limitations

This review integrates literatures that are often considered separately: gendered ageism, leadership backlash, menopause-at-work, expert-witness credibility, forensic workforce conditions and technological change. Its central strength is the distinction between professional capacity and the interpretation of professional capacity, with forensic practice used as a high-stakes application of that distinction.

The evidence base is nevertheless heterogeneous and geographically uneven. Much of the direct evidence concerns gender or age separately rather than their interaction, and several proposed mechanisms—particularly menopause attribution bias and an Indian seniority–authority paradox—remain hypotheses requiring direct testing. The review is structured and multidisciplinary but not a fully documented systematic or PRISMA-ScR review. It therefore identifies conceptual convergence and research priorities rather than estimating pooled effects or prevalence.

A further limitation is that credibility studies frequently use simulated jurors, student samples or tightly controlled scenarios. These designs are valuable for isolating causal mechanisms but cannot fully reproduce long-term professional reputation, institutional hierarchy or repeated courtroom exposure. Conversely, qualitative workplace studies provide contextual richness but are less able to separate gendered attribution from ordinary conflict or performance variation. Triangulation across experiments, longitudinal workplace data and qualitative accounts will therefore be necessary.

CONCLUSION

Gendered ageing in expert work is not a uniform process of decline. Age may increase knowledge,

judgement, confidence and institutional authority while gendered expectations continue to influence how decisiveness, anger, warmth, appearance, adaptability and technological competence are interpreted.

The central forensic-psychological issue is the difference between professional capacity and the social interpretation of that capacity. In forensic medicine, forensic laboratories and expert testimony, this distinction is unusually consequential because credibility affects the reception of scientific evidence and legal decision-making. The key research question is therefore whether increasing experience confers equivalent gains in recognised expert authority across gender, and under what conditions attributional bias interrupts the conversion of expertise into legitimacy.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Global report on ageism. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
2. Eagly AH, Karau SJ. Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychol Rev.* 2002;109(3):573-598. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573.
3. Ryan L, Gatrell C. How are middle- and older-age women employees perceived and treated at work? A review and analysis. *Int J Manag Rev.* 2024;26(4):536-555. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12365.
4. Rudman LA, Glick P. Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *J Soc Issues.* 2001;57(4):743-762. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00239.
5. Amanatullah ET, Tinsley CH. Punishing female negotiators for asserting too much...or not enough: exploring why advocacy moderates backlash against assertive female negotiators. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process.* 2013;120(1):110-122. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2012.03.006.
6. Brescoll VL, Uhlmann EL. Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral, gender, and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Psychol Sci.* 2008;19(3):268-275. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02079.x.
7. Marshburn CK, Cochran KJ, Flynn E, Levine LJ. Workplace anger costs women irrespective of race. *Front Psychol.* 2020;11:579884. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.579884.
8. Block CJ, Gupta A, Li A. Can a relationship buffer women leaders against the negative consequences of anger expression? *J Vocat Behav.* 2022;133:103665. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2021.103665.
9. Chatman JA, Sharps D, Mishra S, Kray LJ, North MS. Agentic but not warm: age-gender interactions and the consequences of stereotype incongruity perceptions for middle-aged professional women. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process.* 2022;173:104190. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2022.104190.
10. Vidhyashree K, Koteswara S, Sheeba B. Menopausal symptoms, work ability, and quality of life: a cross-sectional study among employed women in southern India. *Front Glob Womens Health.* 2026;7:1784887. doi:10.3389/fgwh.2026.1784887.
11. Wall S, Dempsey M, Dockray S, Foley S. The menopausal transition and women's workplace identity: a qualitative systematic review. *SSM Qual Res Health.* 2026;9:100774. doi:10.1016/j.ssmqr.2026.100774.
12. Hughes T, Robertson N. How do female healthcare staff experience the menopause transition in the workplace? A critical meta-synthesis. *Maturitas.* 2026;209:108964. doi:10.1016/j.maturitas.2026.108964.
13. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. OECD Employment Outlook 2025: Can We Get Through the Demographic Crunch? Paris: OECD Publishing; 2025.
14. Briggs A, Butrica B, D'Elia H. AI and Older Workers: Implications and Strategies for Preparing Older Adults for AI in the Workplace. Washington (DC): Urban Institute; 2026.
15. Neal TMS. Women as expert witnesses: a review of the literature. *Behav Sci Law.* 2014;32(2):164-179. doi:10.1002/bsl.2113.
16. Neal TMS, Guadagno RE, Eno CA, Brodsky SL. Warmth and competence on the witness stand: implications for the credibility of male and female expert witnesses. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law.* 2012;40(4):488-497.
17. Larson BA, Brodsky SL. Assertive women as expert witnesses: a study of assertive and defensive responses in male and female experts. *Behav Sci Law.* 2014;32(2):149-163. doi:10.1002/bsl.2116.
18. O'Brien TL. Judging expertise: gender and the negotiation of expert authority in courts. *Soc Curr.* 2016;3(4):315-331. doi:10.1177/2329496516636403.
19. Jones ACT, Repke A, Batastini AB, Sacco D, Dahlen ER, Mohn RS. The power of presentation: how attire, cosmetics, and posture impact the source credibility of women expert witnesses. *J Forensic Sci.* 2023;68(3):962-971. doi:10.1111/1556-4029.15253.
20. Kipoulas E, Edwards I, Radakovic R, Beazley PI. Perceptions of bias and credibility of male and female clinical psychologist and psychiatrist expert witnesses presenting clinical information in the courtroom. *Int J Law Psychiatry.* 2024;96:102016. doi:10.1016/j.ijlp.2024.102016.
21. National Institute of Justice. Conditions affecting forensic scientists' workplace productivity and occupational stress. Washington (DC): U.S. Department of Justice; 2018.
22. Sarwar MH. Occupational burnout in forensic pathology practice: balancing caseload, emotional resilience, and quality of work. *J Forensic Sci.* 2026. doi:10.1111/1556-4029.70264.
23. Shute R, Gamaleldin S, Cain D, Mecray M, Bollenbacher J, Roper-Miller JD. What Forensic

- Science Service Provider Leaders Should Know About Artificial Intelligence and Its Application to Forensic Science. Washington (DC): Office of Justice Programs; 2023. NCJ 308620.
24. World Bank. India Gender Data Landscape: 2026 edition. Washington (DC): World Bank; 2026.
25. Meeta M, Anuradha M, Ashraf AB, Aggarwal K, Digumarti L, Singh T. Clinical Practice Guidelines for Menopause: an executive summary and recommendations: Indian Menopause Society 2026. *J Midlife Health.* 2026;17(Suppl 1):S12-S116. doi:10.4103/jmh.jmh_302_25.