



Introduction

The provided chat screenshots document a **romance scam interaction** on a dating app that was moved to private messaging. The conversation exhibits many hallmarks of a scammer's playbook: rapid intimacy, scripted responses, and manipulative language. In this report, we dissect the dialogue and compare it to known scam scripts (including those used in military or oil-rig scams). We identify psychological tactics like **love bombing**, expressions of fabricated vulnerability, and attempts at control. We also highlight where the scammer effectively *breaks character* and acknowledges the scam, and examine how the user's savvy responses (including some pointed "tips") influenced the scammer's behavior.

Script Analysis

From the outset, the flow of messages follows a **typical romance scam script**. Key stages of the script in this chat included:

- **Fast-Tracked Personal Questions:** The scammer quickly pivoted from greetings to personal details. For example, within minutes they asked *"How old are you?"* and *"Are you married and how about kids?"* – gathering information to tailor their approach. Scammers often do this to build a profile of the target and create false rapport early ¹. In legitimate dating chats, such deep personal questions might unfold more gradually, but scammers rush to deepen the "connection."
- **Rapid Off-Platform Migration:** The conversation took place on Signal after meeting on SayHi, showing the scammer's **urgency to move off the dating app**. Fraud experts warn that scammers almost immediately try to transition to private chat apps (WhatsApp, Google Chat, Telegram, etc.) where they can operate with less oversight ². This case aligns with that pattern – an initial contact on the dating app and then a quick move to Signal for "sweet talk."
- **Photo Exchange and Flattery:** The scammer pushed for a photo early on: *"Can I see a pics of you?"* (notice the grammar). After the user shared a picture, the scammer responded with *"Wow you look handsome"* – a classic **flattery technique**. The user later noted the scammer became upset that they *"have no compliments"* for her photos, saying *"I guess you don't like my pics"*. This guilt-tripping is another manipulation tactic to make the target feel obligated to reassure or please the scammer. Scammers often shower victims with compliments and expect them in return – part of the **"love bombing"** strategy to create a faux emotional bond ³.
- **Love Bombing and Quick Affection:** Within a very short span, the scammer used terms of endearment like *"baby"* and *"honey."* For instance, after a few exchanges about being single, she suddenly said *"Same here baby"*. This is a red flag – scammers commonly **profess strong feelings or use pet names early** to simulate intimacy ³. They want the victim to feel special and emotionally invested. In legitimate relationships, such affection develops over time; here it was nearly immediate. This chat did not quite reach an *"I love you,"* but the overtures (calling the user *"baby"* and saying she's seeking a lifelong partner) serve a similar purpose. The FBI notes that romance scammers aim to **establish a relationship as quickly as possible** and gain your trust, sometimes

even proposing marriage early on ⁴. In this chat, the scammer repeatedly emphasized she was *"looking for long term and serious relationship"* from the get-go – an unrealistic level of commitment for a stranger, and a typical script element.

- **Sob Story and Vulnerability Hooks:** The scammer portrayed herself as lonely and unhappy being single: *"Have been single for the past 3 yrs... I hate being single."* This is designed to elicit sympathy and to mirror the victim's own situation. By saying she's also tired of being alone, she positions herself as the perfect match who just wants love. Scammers often **feign emotional vulnerability or past hardships** to bond with the target. (In other scam personas, this stage might involve a tragic widowhood or a child to take care of – classic in military or oil-rig scam scripts – but the tactic is similar: play on emotions). Here, the "I hate being single" line is the hook. It's worth noting that in many documented romance scams, scammers fabricate elaborate identities (e.g. *widowed engineer on an oil rig, deployed soldier*) to justify why they can't meet in person but desperately seek love ⁵ ⁶. In this chat, the scammer's persona is simpler (a 32-year-old woman "never married with no kids"), yet the *emotional narrative* – lonely and ready to settle down – is very much out of the scammer's playbook.

- **Escalating Commitment & Future Plans:** The scammer pressed the issue of a serious relationship quickly. She said she's *"here looking for long term and serious relationship with the right man"*. By 20 minutes into the chat (timestamps ~8:20 AM), she was essentially auditioning the user as a husband figure, even adding a strangely specific line: *"a man that could take good care of my body because I'm always wanting my body to be clean and clear for my man."* This odd statement reads like a copy-pasted script designed to sound alluring, but it comes off as *unnatural*. We'll examine the language more in the next section, but in terms of script, this is a textbook move: **promise the fantasy of an ideal partner** (she's ready to devote herself and even keeps herself "clean" for her man) to entice the victim. Scammers often **mimic what they think the target wants to hear** – for example, if someone is seeking a serious partner, the scammer promptly claims to want marriage or lifelong love ⁵. Here the user was a divorced single father; the scammer immediately positioned herself as a devoted, marriage-minded younger woman – ostensibly an "ideal" match to hook him.

- **Maintaining Control and Urgency:** At points where the user didn't respond quickly or showed hesitation, the scammer tried to regain control. When the user didn't compliment her photos, she expressed hurt to prompt a reassuring reply. Later, after the user challenged her to prove her identity (more on that soon) and then went quiet, she sent: *"Baby what's wrong why are you not talking to me, I did what you want me to do."* The tone here is a mix of feigned concern and subtle pressure. Scammers often panic if a victim pulls away; they might guilt-trip or act distressed to reel the person back. As Scamwatch notes, a red flag is when **scammers get angry or upset if you resist their requests or pull back**, sometimes even threatening to end the relationship ⁷. In this chat, she wasn't overtly angry, but the *"I did what you asked, why are you ignoring me?"* message is a clear attempt to elicit guilt and prompt the user to re-engage. This sense of *urgency* – needing constant communication and fast progression – is another scam hallmark.

- **Deference and Adaptation:** An interesting twist in this conversation is how the scammer adapted when the user didn't play along with the "instant soulmate" narrative. When the user said they weren't ready for anything serious (citing just coming out of an 18-year marriage), the scammer quickly backpedaled: *"Ohh so you don't want me? Or you want us to be friends first?"* Instead of cutting losses, she adjusted the script, offering to be "friends first." This is a manipulative tactic: it plays on

fear of loss (“you don’t want me?” said with a sad emoji) and at the same time keeps a foot in the door by agreeing to go slower. Scammers will often **mold their story if a victim shows hesitation** – the ultimate goal is to keep the victim engaged, even if it means deviating from the original script. In known scam scenarios, if a victim expresses doubt about sending money, the scammer might momentarily drop the request or send small “gifts” to appear trustworthy, only to try again later. Here, the adaptation was emotional: she agreed to friendship, hoping to later ramp back up to romance once trust was restored. The scammer’s willingness to negotiate the relationship speed is itself a scripted strategy to **avoid losing the mark**.

Notably, this scam attempt was interrupted before the final phases typically seen in military or oil-rig scams. Usually, after building enough trust, the scammer would manufacture a crisis or request – e.g. *“I need money for a plane ticket/medical emergency/customs fees”* ⁸. In this chat, thanks to the user’s intervention, the scammer never got to ask for money. However, the trajectory was clearly headed there. All the earlier steps – intense flattery, talk of a shared future, and emotional dependence – were setting the stage for a **financial ask**. The absence of any mention of the scammer’s job or a concrete excuse for not meeting (like *“I’m deployed”* or *“I work on an oil rig”*) by the mid-chat is interesting; possibly, she planned to introduce a sudden emergency later as the reason for needing help. Many scammers hold off the money request until they’ve secured the victim’s affection over days or weeks. Here, only a few hours had passed. Given more time, it’s likely we would have seen a story about a financial problem or an attempt to guide the user into a bogus investment (another increasingly common angle) ⁹.

In summary, the dialogue ticks the boxes of a **romance scam script**: rapid intimacy, lots of personal info exchanged, idealized relationship talk, and emotional manipulation – all before any real-life meeting. It mirrors elements seen in military and oil-rig scam formats (quick devotion, excuses to avoid meeting, etc.), even though the specific backstory here differed. Next, we examine the **language patterns and anomalies** that give away the “scripted” nature of the scam.

Language Patterns

The language used by the scammer in these messages contains **tell-tale signs of scam scripting and non-native English**. Several patterns stand out:

- **Unusual Grammar and Phrasing:** Right away, one can spot minor grammar errors that aren’t typical of a fluent native speaker. For example, the scammer asked, *“Can I see a pics of you?”* – using “a pics” instead of “a pic” or “a photo.” This kind of plural/singular mix-up is a small red flag. Likewise, the scammer said *“am 32 single never married and I don’t have kids”* all in one run-on sentence. A native speaker would likely say **“I’m 32, single, never married, and I don’t have any kids.”** The lack of the pronoun “I” at the start (am 32...) is common in broken English texts. Later, she wrote *“Have been single for the past 3yrs...”* instead of **“I have been single for 3 years.”** These consistent drops of the subject pronoun hint at someone thinking in another language pattern. As one guide puts it, *“A dead giveaway! Scammers often cannot write a complete, proper English sentence”* ¹⁰. The messages here reflect that – they are understandable, but slightly *off* in a way that suggests a script or a non-native writer.
- **Scripted, Generic Lines:** Some lines the scammer used read as if copied from a romance-scam script template. The most glaring example is the earlier quote: *“I am here looking for long term and serious relationship with the right man for me, a man that could take good care of my body because am*

always wanting my body to be clean and clear for my man." This does not sound like something an English-fluent person would naturally say in casual chat. It's overly formal, repetitive (**my body** mentioned twice), and oddly specific about hygiene. This kind of **unnatural monologue** is a red flag that the person is reciting a pre-written script. In fact, the user immediately picked up on this. He later told the scammer: *"You need to work on your script here, 'am here looking for long term and serious relationship with the right man for me..."*" – directly quoting that line back to her as evidence it was formulaic. Romance scammers are known to use scripted profiles and canned lines, often the same phrasing across many victims ¹¹. Here we see it in action. By contrast, authentic daters usually write more spontaneously. The scammer's message reads like a marketing pitch for herself – which indeed it is, in a fraudulent way.

- **Abrupt Tone Shifts and Inconsistency:** The scammer's tone oscillated between saccharine affection and sudden formality or despair, which feels inconsistent. For example, she smoothly goes from calling the user *"dear"/"baby"* in one moment to sounding almost transactional the next moment. When the user said he isn't ready for a serious relationship, her reply *"Ohh so you don't want me?"* is dramatically pitiable, then one line later she is businesslike: *"Or you want us to be friends first?"* These shifts suggest she's flipping through **script pages** to find something that works – first the wounded lover act, then the reasonable compromise. It doesn't read as one person's genuine voice, but rather a series of persona tactics. Real people usually have a consistent style in chat; scammers may accidentally drop different pre-scripted lines that don't fully mesh in tone.
- **Overuse of Terms of Endearment:** As noted, calling someone *"honey," "sweetie," "dear,"* or *"baby"* almost immediately is classic scammer behavior. In this chat, by the time the scammer said *"Same here baby"* and *"Oh yeah honey"*, they had only just learned basic info about each other. Legitimate daters rarely deploy pet names in the first hour of conversation. Scammers do it to fast-track emotional intimacy – what psychologists refer to as **love bombing**. Sources warn that *"They may use terms of endearment such as sweetie, honey, and baby – telling you they love you within a few weeks, or even hours."* ³. In our case it was within minutes. This language pattern is a strong indicator the person is following a script that dictates quickly binding the victim with romantic language.
- **Culturally Off Idioms:** The scammer's phrasing sometimes didn't match how a typical American (which she purported to be) would phrase things. The line about keeping her body *"clean and clear"* for her man stands out – it's just *not* an expression common in American dating talk. It sounds like something translated or repurposed, perhaps meant to imply she is well-groomed or even virginal, but it lands strangely. Another example: after the user didn't immediately praise her pictures, she said, *"you have no compliments for it."* That phrasing is a bit awkward; a native speaker might say *"I noticed you didn't say anything about my picture"* rather than *you have no compliments*. These slight idiomatic oddities accumulate and signal that the person might not be who they claim. Romance scammers often operate from countries where English isn't the first language ¹², so their script can include unusual wording. The user in this chat clearly noticed these tells. He later commented (sarcastically) that some of her **shorter messages** felt more natural: *"Your short sentences were pretty good though... That one sounded pretty natural. That's how American women talk."* Here he was referring to a specific line she had written that *did* sound convincing – likely *"Or you want us to be friends first?"* – and contrasting it with the more stilted lines. This indicates the scammer had interspersed a few normal-sounding sentences amid the scripted text, perhaps when typing a quick reply like *"Ohh"* or *"Wait."* The user effectively gave her language feedback, distinguishing the *scripted* vs. *authentic* sounding parts!

In summary, the linguistic profile of the scammer's messages – small grammar slips, out-of-place phrases, and overly lovey-dovey or formal chunks of text – strongly suggest a non-native English speaker following a template. These patterns match documented scammer language. They rely on a lexicon of romantic clichés and often slip up on natural syntax, which is one way people **spot a scam in progress**. In fact, scam awareness guides encourage looking for such odd language as a clue ¹³. This chat provides a textbook example.

Confession Review

Perhaps the most fascinating part of this exchange is when the scammer **effectively admits to the scam** – or at least drops the act – after being confronted by the user. This occurs toward the end of the conversation, when the user starts openly rating and critiquing the scammer's performance. Let's break down that pivotal moment:

After the scammer complied with the user's demand to send a verification video (she presumably sent a short video saying his name, as he requested), the user went quiet for a bit. The scammer grew anxious and sent the *"Baby... I did what you want"* message at 11:48 AM, indicating she had *tried* to prove she's real. The user, rather than responding with gratitude or continued romance, came back with a completely unexpected approach – **he treated the whole chat like a scam he was reviewing**.

Around 12:27 PM, the user wrote something to the effect of: *"I'll probably give this one a six out of 10."* This remark is him **scoring the scam attempt**. One can imagine the scammer's shock at receiving that message. The chat logs then show the user saying, *"You need to work on your script here..."*, directly calling it a "script" and quoting the scammer's long "looking for the right man...take care of my body" line as an example of where she went wrong. In other words, he explicitly said *"I know this is a scam script, and it's not a very good one."*

At this juncture, the scammer's responses are very telling. First, she replied with *"Ohhh...."* and perhaps an emoji – indicating surprise or dismay (12:28 PM timestamp). Crucially, she **did not deny the accusation**. She didn't say "What do you mean script? I'm real!" which one might expect if she were truly just an offended genuine person. Instead, her next reply was *"Which one?"* at 12:31 PM – in direct response to the user's comment that her "short sentences were pretty good." The user had said *"Your short sentences were pretty good though."* She asked, *"Which one?"* – essentially she is **engaging in the critique**, wanting to know which of her lines sounded convincing. This is as close to an admission as you'll get: the scammer dropped all pretense of *"I really love you"* and started asking for feedback on her scam scripting! It's a tacit confession that yes, she was using a script and now was curious what parts fooled the target.

The user then highlighted the line *"Or you want us to be friends first?"* as one that *"sounded pretty natural... how American women talk."* The scammer's reaction isn't fully shown in text, but we see she continued conversing in this meta mode briefly (there's a fragment "Same here baby – That's go..." likely cut off). By that point, the romantic narrative had completely unraveled. The power dynamic flipped – **the scammer went from manipulator to being almost a pupil, momentarily**, asking which elements of her performance were effective. This is a remarkable moment of candor, albeit an implicit one.

In scam-baiting circles (people who intentionally engage scammers to waste their time or gather information), it's known that sometimes when caught, a scammer might drop the act. Some will get angry or go silent, but others might actually confess out of frustration or even strangely befriend the baiter. In this

case, the scammer didn't outright say *"Yes, I'm a scammer"*, but her behavior amounted to the same. She effectively acknowledged the presence of a "script" and showed interest in the user's analysis of it. The **admission is in the actions and the shift in tone**. No more talk of love or meeting – the facade was gone.

The language around that moment is quite interesting. When the user says *"six out of 10"*, he's treating her like a scammer he's grading. She responds *"Ohh... Yeah you guys kind of rushed it."* That line "you guys kind of rushed it" appears to refer back to an earlier discussion about the user's past marriage (she had said "you guys rushed it" about his marriage). But now, in context, it almost reads like she might be reflecting on *her own rushed approach*. Possibly the OCR mix-up aside, the log shows the user's critique and her acknowledging something was rushed or not done well. Then the user explicitly calls it a script problem. Her *"Which one?"* response is practically an admission that she indeed was using *lines* and wasn't sure which short line he meant was good.

It's worth highlighting how extraordinary it is for a scammer to drop the act like this. It only happened because the user confronted her in a way that implied he knew exactly what was going on (and wasn't angry, even – he was almost mock-helpful). By engaging, she essentially confirmed the ruse. This moment provides a rare glimpse "behind the curtain" of the scam. The scammer's **psychological control snapped**; she was no longer in role as the loving girlfriend, but rather as someone concerned with the quality of her scam script.

In summary, the *confession* or reveal occurs in that section where the user names her behavior as a scripted scam and she neither denies it nor tries to continue the lovey-dovey front. Instead, she asks for clarification on his critique – implicitly admitting everything. This aligns with reports that **scammers do have scripts** and even internally call them scripts ¹¹. In this case, when faced with a knowledgeable target, the scammer dropped her mask and essentially said *"Okay, which parts of my script worked on you?"* It's a fleeting but crucial part of the chat that confirms the analysis: the conversation was a staged scam attempt from her side.

User Influence

The user's handling of the situation significantly influenced the scammer's behavior at multiple points. Unlike an unsuspecting victim, the user here was alert and even a bit mischievous in turning the tables. Let's evaluate how the user's actions affected the flow, and whether those actions might *teach* the scammer or alter her future tactics:

- **Demanding Verification:** Early on, the user became suspicious (likely due to the red flags discussed) and tested the scammer. He said *"Well, let's start with this – make a video here in the app and say my name."* This is a savvy move often recommended to verify if someone is real. Scammers notoriously avoid video calls or live videos ¹⁴. Here, the scammer initially stalled (she asked "What's your name?" despite presumably knowing it from the profile, suggesting she might be stalling or didn't pay attention to the details). The user insisted, and then went quiet with a "Wait." The scammer actually **spent hours and complied** – by 11:48 AM she claimed "I did what you want me to do," implying she somehow produced a video. This is remarkable because it shows the **user's assertiveness pushed the scammer off-script**. She likely scrambled to create a fake verification – perhaps by writing his name on paper while recording, or dubbing audio over a stolen video. The fact that it took from ~8:30 to 11:30 AM suggests she had to work at it. The user's challenge clearly put her on the defensive and made her invest time. This tactic likely *delayed or disrupted* her usual

progression to asking for money. It also served as a trap: by demanding something scammers find hard to provide, the user gained the upper hand. In broader terms, this shows that an informed user can **influence scammer behavior by setting conditions**, though one must be cautious – some scammers will vanish or become hostile if pressed. In this case, her desire to keep him hooked was so strong she attempted the proof.

- **Feigning Interest & Giving Rope:** Throughout, the user played along just enough to keep the scammer talking. He answered her questions, exchanged photos, and even complimented her (e.g. *"You're gorgeous of course"* he says at one point). These responses likely encouraged the scammer to continue, thinking she had an interested mark. By not confronting too early, the user was able to observe more of her script (gathering evidence, as it were). This is a classic scam-baiting technique: **give the scammer a bit of what they want (attention, flattery)** so they reveal more of their modus operandi. The user here gave her tips like *"I was just waking up"* as an excuse and then a compliment to mollify her when she complained about lack of praise. This likely calmed the scammer and made her think he was still on the hook – thus she proceeded to ask *"How long have you been single...?"* and so on, providing more material for analysis. Essentially, the user's controlled engagement influenced the scammer to **spill her entire script**. Had he cut her off too soon, we wouldn't see those later stages (like the body-care line or the "friends first" adaptation).
- **Guiding the Conversation Pivot:** When the user decided to confront, he did so in a novel way – by giving a "review." This non-antagonistic confrontation (almost comedic in tone) confused but intrigued the scammer. Instead of immediately blocking him or unleashing anger, she actually responded, as we saw. The user's phrasing *"I give this one a 6/10"* was likely so unexpected that the scammer stayed to see what he meant. In effect, the user **set the tone** for an honest conversation by treating it like a critique session rather than an attack. This greatly influenced the outcome: the scammer dropped her guard instead of fleeing. It's possible that if the user had simply cursed her out or bluntly accused "You're a scammer, I'm reporting you," she might have vanished without further word. By contrast, his almost collegial approach ("here's where your scam script needs work") prompted her to stick around and *learn*. This shows the user cleverly influenced the scammer's behavior by choosing a disarming way to expose her.
- **Providing "Tips" to the Scammer:** Indeed, the user explicitly gave feedback on what lines sounded authentic. While this is satisfying from an analytical standpoint, it does raise the point: will the scammer use these tips to **improve her future scams**? The user essentially told her which parts of her script were too fake and which seemed real. For example, he highlighted that "Or you want us to be friends first?" sounded natural. A scammer can take that information and incorporate more lines like that in the future, potentially making her approach more convincing to the next victim. This is an unintended consequence of engaging with scammers – one might inadvertently educate them. The user likely was aware of this risk but proceeded for the sake of exposing the truth. In this scenario, his tips definitely *influenced the scammer's perspective*. She may adjust her script, perhaps dropping bizarre lines like the "take care of my body" bit or being more cautious with grammar and timing of affection. On the flip side, one could argue the user's confrontation also **demoralized** the scammer. Being unmasked and critiqued might discourage or slow her down, at least temporarily. Her ego was certainly bruised by a 6/10 score on her con! We don't see her final reaction beyond the partial engagement; she might have eventually gone silent or exited once it was clear there'd be no payoff.

- **Preventing Further Harm:** The user's actions also meant that *no money was sent* and the scam went no further. By influencing the scammer to reveal herself and then effectively ending the scam, the user protected himself (and also gathered intel that could help others). He also possibly kept the scammer occupied for a good part of the day – time she could not spend victimizing someone else. This is a known tactic among some anti-scam activists: string the scammer along to waste their time. In that sense, the user's engagement had a positive influence in reducing the scammer's capacity (at least for that day).

In conclusion, the user's proactive and insightful responses heavily dictated the course of this interaction. He managed to **flip the power dynamic**, leading the scammer to do things on his terms (e.g. creating a video) and even seek his approval on her technique. While this gave the scammer some pointers (which is a bit concerning, as it could refine her scam), it also *completely undermined her con*. By the end, she had gained nothing and exposed everything. The user's approach underscores that an informed, confident target can disrupt a scam – though it's not generally advisable for everyone to engage a scammer this deeply, as it can be risky. In this case, it worked out in the user's favor, and the scammer was left effectively admitting defeat.

Conclusion

This chat interaction is a prime example of a **romance scam script in action** – and being unraveled. The scammer employed classic techniques: fast intimacy, excessive flattery, urgent emotional appeals, and hints of an “instant soulmate” connection. These align closely with known scammer playbooks in both **language and strategy**, whether it's a faux-oil-rig worker promising to settle down or a supposed lonely heart on a dating app. We saw elements of **love bombing** (early “baby/honey” usage and constant attention) and the strategic crafting of a perfect match persona (liking what the user likes, wanting exactly what the user wants) which is exactly how many scammers operate ⁵. We also noted the absence of any real, specific details about the scammer's life (no real job info or last name given) – a blank those larger scam archetypes usually fill with lies about military service or remote work ⁶. The result, however, was the same goal: build trust and romantic feelings quickly in order to later exploit them.

Linguistically, the dialogue contained many **red flags**: slightly broken English, oddly formal declarations of love, and canned lines that a genuine person is unlikely to say. These patterns match documented observations that most online romance scammers are **working from scripts and often typing in a second language** ¹³. The conversation here literally exposed the “script” – once the user pointed it out, the scammer didn't even try to deny it. That moment where the scammer asks “Which one [sounded natural]?” is effectively the smoking gun proving that the beautiful persona was a concoction, pieced together from a playbook of romantic one-liners.

Crucially, this case also highlights the importance of **awareness and skepticism** on the part of potential victims. The user recognized the scam early and managed the interaction to glean insights without falling victim. The fact that he got the scammer to make a proof-of-life video and then admit to scripting is quite extraordinary – and it underscores how far scammers will go if they think there's a payout, as well as how they falter when their script falls apart. The user's behavior did carry the side effect of educating the scammer to some degree (which we generally *don't* want to do, as it can make scams harder to spot for others), but it also completely defused this scam attempt. The scammer was left effectively saying “*you got me*”, and no fraud was committed.

In comparing this to broader scam patterns, we see more similarities than differences. Whether it's a "woman on a dating app" scam like this or the archetypal "widowed oil rig engineer" scam, the **psychological levers** are the same: rapid affection, isolation to private chats, grand promises, and eventually a plea for help (usually financial). This chat checked all but the last box – and likely only missed the money request because the user intervened. It serves as a micro-study of how romance scammers operate and how an astute target can recognize the **linguistic and behavioral cues** of a scam. Each element – from calling someone "dear" too soon to spinning tales of devotion – is documented in anti-scam resources as a warning sign ¹ ³ .

In conclusion, the messages do align closely with known scammer scripts. The scammer here may not have claimed to be in the army or on an oil rig, but she didn't need to – the *language of fake love* was all the same. The interplay we observed, especially the "*confession*" segment, is a rare and informative look at the scammer's side of things. For anyone reading these findings, the key takeaways are clear: **be extremely wary of anyone who professes deep feelings online very quickly, who insists on moving to private messaging, and whose stories or wording seem oddly generic or "too good to be true."** Those are the footprints of a scam. As this case showed, once confronted with those facts, even the scammer couldn't keep up the charade.

Sources: Authorities like Scamwatch and the FTC note that romance scammers often move conversations off-platform and shower targets with affection to manipulate them ¹ ² . Common red flags include immediate pet names, inconsistent or poor English, and refusing to meet in person ³ ¹⁵ . All these signs were present in the SayHi/Signal chat, confirming that it was following a well-worn fraud template rather than a genuine connection.

¹ ⁷ ¹⁴ Online dating and romance scams | Scamwatch

<https://www.scamwatch.gov.au/types-of-scams/online-dating-and-romance-scams>

² ⁵ ⁹ Romance scammers' favorite lies exposed | Federal Trade Commission

<https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/data-visualizations/data-spotlight/2023/02/romance-scammers-favorite-lies-exposed>

³ ¹⁰ ¹¹ ¹² ¹³ Scammer Red Flags | How to Spot and Avoid Romance Scams

<https://advocatingforu.com/scammer-red-flags/>

⁴ ¹⁵ Romance Scams — FBI

<https://www.fbi.gov/how-we-can-help-you/scams-and-safety/common-frauds-and-scams/romance-scams>

⁶ ⁸ What to Know About Romance Scams | Consumer Advice

<https://consumer.ftc.gov/articles/what-know-about-romance-scams>