

CyberBOT: Towards Reliable Cybersecurity Education via Ontology-Grounded Retrieval Augmented Generation

Chengshuai Zhao[♠], Riccardo De Maria[♠], Tharindu Kumarage[♠], Kumar Satvik Chaudhary[♠], Garima Agrawal[♠], Yiwen Li[♥], Jongchan Park[♥], Yuli Deng[♠], Ying-Chih Chen[♥], Huan Liu[♠]

[♠]School of Computing and Augmented Intelligence, Arizona State University

[♥]Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, Arizona State University

{czhao93, rdemari1, kskumara, kchaud13, garima.agrawal, yiwenli2, jpark366, ydeng19, ychen495, huanliu}@asu.edu

Abstract

Advancements in large language models (LLMs) have enabled the development of intelligent educational tools that support inquiry-based learning across technical domains. In cybersecurity education, where accuracy and safety are paramount, systems must go beyond surface-level relevance to provide information that is both trustworthy and domain-appropriate. To address this challenge, we introduce CyberBOT¹, a question-answering chatbot that leverages a retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) pipeline to incorporate contextual information from course-specific materials and validate responses using a domain-specific cybersecurity ontology. The ontology serves as a structured reasoning layer that constrains and verifies LLM-generated answers, reducing the risk of misleading or unsafe guidance. CyberBOT has been deployed in a large graduate-level course at Arizona State University (ASU)², where more than one hundred students actively engage with the system through a dedicated web-based platform. Computational evaluations in lab environments highlight the potential capacity of CyberBOT, and a forthcoming field study will evaluate its pedagogical impact. By integrating structured domain reasoning with modern generative capabilities, CyberBOT illustrates a promising direction for developing reliable and curriculum-aligned AI applications in specialized educational contexts.

1 Introduction

The integration of large language models (LLMs) into educational applications has introduced new opportunities for personalized, interactive learning experiences (Dandachi, 2024; Zhao et al., 2024; Yekollu et al., 2024). In particular, question-answering (QA) systems powered by LLMs offer the potential to support self-paced inquiry and

deepen conceptual understanding (Gill et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2025). However, despite their generative capabilities, LLMs often suffer from factual inaccuracies and hallucinations (Jiang et al., 2024), mainly when applied to high-stakes and technically demanding domains such as cybersecurity education (Triplett, 2023). The risks associated with such outputs, ranging from conceptual misunderstanding to propagation of unsafe practices (Tan et al., 2024b,a; Zou et al., 2023), underscore the need for enhanced reliability in educational settings.

Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) has emerged as a common strategy to improve response accuracy by conditioning model outputs on retrieved external documents (Lewis et al., 2020). Although this approach increases contextual relevance, it does not offer a guarantee of correctness, particularly when the retrieved context is ambiguous or incomplete (Barnett et al., 2024). Consequently, RAG-based systems remain susceptible to producing only loosely grounded responses in the underlying knowledge base, leading to challenges in ensuring content validity and safety.

To address these limitations, we propose CyberBOT, a QA system tailored for cybersecurity education that introduces a novel ontology-based validation mechanism as a core architectural component. The system integrates a domain-specific cybersecurity ontology to assess the factual validity of LLM-generated responses. This ontology captures structured domain knowledge in the form of typed entities, relationships, and logical constraints, offering a principled framework for verifying that generated answers conform to the semantics and procedural norms of the field. Unlike traditional static knowledge bases, ontologies provide a formal representation of domain concepts and their interrelations, enabling richer and more systematic validation of model responses.

In CyberBOT, the question-answering process consists of three sequential stages, each contribut-

¹Code: <https://github.com/rccrdmr/CyberBOT>

²Video: <https://youtu.be/m4ZCYs4u210>




Figure 1: Framework of proposed CyberBOT. Students submit queries to UI and get responses from the backend.

ing to the reliability and contextual relevance of the system’s output as illustrated in Figure 1. First, an intent interpreter analyzes the multi-turn conversational history to infer the student’s underlying intent. This component reformulates the user query into a context-enriched, knowledge-intensive version, thereby enabling more effective retrieval in multi-round interactions. Second, based on the interpreted intent, relevant documents are retrieved from a curated course-specific knowledge base using retrieval-augmented generation techniques. These documents serve as the contextual foundation for generating an initial response with the LLM. Finally, the generated answer is validated using a domain-specific cybersecurity ontology, which ensures semantic alignment with authoritative knowledge and filters out hallucinated or unsafe content. This three-stage architecture allows CyberRAG to address both contextual ambiguity and factual correctness, significantly enhancing the trustworthiness and educational value of the system in real-world instructional settings.

A key strength of CyberBOT lies in its real-world deployment. The system has been integrated into a live classroom setting and is accessible to more than one hundred graduate students enrolled in the spring 2025 semester of CSE 546: Cloud Computing course at Arizona State University (ASU). Students interact with the system via a dedicated web interface, submitting course-related queries and receiving validated responses to assist with their study. This deployment enables direct observation of system usage in an authentic educational environment and provides a valuable opportunity to evaluate the practical utility and pedagogical effectiveness of ontology-informed validation in question-answering systems.

Computational evaluations in lab environments highlight the potential capacity of CyberBOT. To systematically assess its impact, we plan to conduct a field study at the end of the academic term. This

study will examine student perceptions of answer accuracy, relevance, trustworthiness, and overall satisfaction. The findings will inform future development and offer broader insights into the role of ontology-aware validation in educational AI systems. In summary, our contributions include:

- ✦ We propose a novel QA system CyberBOT that combines RAG with cybersecurity ontologies for answer validation, reducing hallucinations, and improving factual accuracy in a specialized domain.
- ✦ We construct a knowledge base from class materials to ground the QA system’s responses in relevant, contextually accurate information aligned with the course curriculum.
- ✦ We deploy CyberBOT as a user-friendly Q&A platform, in a live classroom with more than one hundred students, with the goal of providing practical insights into the system’s performance and student engagement.

2 The proposed CyberBOT

We introduce CyberBOT, an ontology-aware RAG system designed for multi-turn QA in cybersecurity education. Broadly, the system operates in three key steps: (I) First, an intent model interprets the student’s question based on the chat history (Section 2.1). (II) Next, based on the identified intent, relevant documents are retrieved from the knowledge base to augment the LLM’s response (Section 2.2). (III) Finally, a carefully designed knowledge graph ontology is employed to validate the generated answer (Section 2.3). The overall framework is illustrated in Figure 1, and a step-by-step example with data flow is shown in Figure 2.

2.1 Intent Interpreter

Given a domain-specific question q , we leverage an intent model \mathcal{I} as an intent interpreter to capture




Figure 2: Illustrative of data flow in CyberBOT. The response is augmented and validated in various flows.

the user's intention from the last k -round history conversation c . Then, the intent model will rewrite the current query as a knowledge-intensive conversation query q_c : $q_c = \mathcal{I}(q, c)$, which not only enriches the context for the generation and enables multi-turn retrieval. In the implementation, we design a semantic rule-based classifier to determine if a question needs to be written or not to reduce the computational cost.

2.2 Retrieval Augmented Generation

Based on the conversation query, the model retrieves the related document from a knowledge base. Then, the augmented context is used to prompt LLMs to generate the answer.

2.2.1 Knowledge Base

The knowledge base plays a critical role in supporting the responses of CyberBOT and consists of two main components: (I) A collection of common cybersecurity QA pairs curated by domain experts, derived from laboratory instruction manuals used in graduate-level advanced cybersecurity courses. These cover topics such as building intrusion detection systems and monitoring system activity. (II) Course materials from CSE 546: Cloud Computing at ASU, including lecture slides, assignments, quizzes, and project instructions. Most of these resources are in PDF format, which we preprocess into smaller, semantically meaningful chunks before storing them in the knowledge base.

2.2.2 Retriever

For each turn in the conversation, given the conversation query q_c , the retriever module \mathcal{R} selects the most relevant document d from the corresponding course-specific knowledge base by computing similarity scores: $d = \mathcal{R}(q_c, kb)$. To accelerate

retrieval, all documents are pre-encoded into vector representations, allowing for efficient similarity search within the knowledge base.

2.2.3 Generation

The user query, as well as the related document, is used to prompt LLM \mathcal{G} to generate preliminary answers a : $a = \mathcal{G}(q_c, d)$.

2.3 Ontology-based Validation

In practice, validating the generated answers is essential to prevent misinformation or misuse. To address this, we design an ontology-based validation mechanism grounded in domain knowledge. As described earlier, a knowledge graph (KG) captures factual triples in the form of entity-relationship-entity, while an ontology defines high-level domain concepts and their semantic relationships in a structured hierarchy.

Our validation process begins by extracting and analyzing key concepts and their relationships from the course materials. These are then distilled by cybersecurity experts into a domain-specific ontology o , encapsulating essential patterns and logical structures. Finally, we employ an ontology verifier \mathcal{V} to assess whether the generated answer aligns with the ontology: $r = \mathcal{O}(q_c, a, o)$, where $r \in (0, 1)$ represents the validation score. Answers falling below a certain threshold are flagged and rejected to ensure the reliability and domain-appropriateness of the system's responses.

2.4 Student Learning History

To facilitate personalized learning, we designed a user management system, which tracks each user's learning log and stores it in the backend while anonymizing personal information.




Figure 3: Pipeline of the project. The key details for each step are elaborated.

3 System Deployment

Our system architecture, as shown in Figure 3, is designed to streamline the entire workflow from data ingestion to end-user interaction and evaluation. Here we discuss the deployment stage, detailing the user-facing and backend components.

3.1 User Interface

We build a simple, web-based front-end using Streamlit, an open-source Python framework that allows rapid development of interactive web apps. Users enter queries or select tasks, and the interface displays the system’s responses in real-time.

3.2 Backend

All domain-specific materials (e.g., QA pairs, slides, assignments) are stored in a unified repository. Texts are split into chunks with 512 tokens to facilitate efficient retrieval. Each chunk is embedded using BAAI-Bge-Large-1.5, and stored in a FAISS index. User queries are similarly embedded, and nearest-neighbor search identifies the most relevant chunks. A llama 3.3 70B model classifies queries according to task-specific intentions. Based on these results, the system retrieves top-3 relevant chunks from FAISS for context. Another Llama 3.3 70B model fuses the retrieved context and the user query to generate a coherent response. This step handles reasoning and synthesizes domain knowledge for the final output. The Ontology Verifier, powered by llama 3.3 70B, evaluates the generated responses by verifying their alignment with our domain-specific ontology. A lightweight SQLite database is used to store session data and interaction logs for subsequent analysis.

3.3 Device and Hardware

We encapsulate the CyberBOT into a docker environment and develop the system in the dedicated server with one A100 80GB. For convenience, we use Together AI API to enable all the embedding models or LLMs. For security reasons, a VPN with ASU credentials will be needed to access the system outside the university network.

4 Application

We have deployed CyberBOT into CSE 546: Cloud Computing for the 2025 Spring semester. The application scenario shows retrieval augment generation and learning history track (Section 4.1). We conduct comprehensive lab experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of CyberBOT (Section 4.2). Furthermore, we design controlled experiments and plan to conduct field surveys to evaluate the tool within an educational context (section 4.3).

4.1 Use-Case Illustration

Users can input domain-specific questions through the dialogue interface. The RAG system retrieves relevant documents from the appropriate knowledge base and generates ontology-validated responses. If a query falls outside the scope of the defined domain ontology, the response is rejected to maintain reliability and relevance. Given the highly specialized nature of the knowledge base, the system serves as an effective AI assistant for: (I) learning cybersecurity and cloud computing concepts grounded in course material, (II) assisting with assignment-related queries by providing step-by-step explanations, and (III) offering fine-grained, hands-on guidance for course projects, such as code completion and framework design. Additionally, all interactions, including user queries and corre-

sponding responses, are stored under each user’s account. These historical conversation logs can serve as a foundation for developing individualized learning paths and enabling personalized educational experiences in the future.

4.2 Computational Evaluation

Dataset. To evaluate the performance of CyberBOT in a controlled lab setting, we use CyberQ (Agrawal et al., 2024b), an open-source dataset comprising approx 3,500 open-ended cybersecurity QA pairs across topics such as tool usage, setup instructions, attack analysis, and defense techniques. The dataset includes questions of varying complexity, categorized into Zero-shot (1,027), Few-shot (332), and Ontology-Driven (2,171) types, making it well-suited for testing multi-level question answering.

Metric. We consider two categories of metrics: (I) QA-based metrics, which evaluate the quality of generated answers, including BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2020), METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005), ROUGE-1 (Lin, 2004), and ROUGE-2 (Lin, 2004). (II) RAG-based metrics, which assess the retrieval effectiveness and accuracy covering Faithfulness, Answer Relevancy, Context Precision, Context Recall, and Context Entity Recall. We implement RAG-based metric using RAGAS (Es et al., 2024).

Metric	ZS	FS	OD	AVG
QA-based Metrics				
BERTScore \uparrow	0.929	0.946	0.933	0.933
METEOR \uparrow	0.786	0.859	0.786	0.793
ROUGE-1 \uparrow	0.649	0.788	0.641	0.657
ROUGE-2 \uparrow	0.598	0.720	0.593	0.606
RAG-based Metrics				
Faithfulness \uparrow	0.813	0.891	0.760	0.788
Answer Relevancy \uparrow	0.983	0.986	0.983	0.983
Context Precision \uparrow	0.989	1.000	0.996	0.994
Context Recall \uparrow	0.991	0.997	0.995	0.994
Context Entity Recall \uparrow	0.939	0.951	0.967	0.957

Table 1: Performance of CyberBOT for QA-based and RAG-based metrics across various datasets.

Main result. We summarize the main result in Table 1. (I) Generally, the proposed tool achieves satisfaction across both QA-based metrics and RAG-based metrics, e.g., CyberBOT achieves an average of BERTScore and Context Recall of 0.933 and 0.994 respectively, which indicates the system not only generates high-quality answers but it also can retrieve the very relevant document from

the knowledge base. (II) The framework produces higher scores in the FS category than those in ZS and OD, which may be because the QA pairs in the FS leverage in-context learning examples and are thus more consistent. (III) Among the QA-based metrics, the system achieves superior performance under BERTScore compared to others. It suggests that the generated answer has good overall semantic similarity while producing various words and paraphrases. (IV) Among the RAG-based metric, we can observe that the results under Answer Relevancy, Context Precision, and Context Recall are very competitive, which showcases the framework benefits from related documents as references. However, the Faithfulness score is slightly lower because the model will leverage its own knowledge to generate answers when there is no closely relevant material in the knowledge base.

4.3 Educational Impact Evaluation

Controlled experiment. To evaluate the effectiveness of CyberBOT, a domain-specific chatbot for CSE 546: Cloud Computing coursework, we conduct a quasi-experimental study involving 77 computer science ASU graduate students. Using Monte Carlo random assignment (Metropolis and Ulam, 1949) stratified by gender, 39 students gain chatbot access (experimental group), while 38 students complete coursework without AI support (control group). The chatbot, built specifically on course materials (e.g., textbooks, slides, project instruction), is the only permitted AI assistance. External AI tools are explicitly prohibited. We adopt a mixed-method approach using both quantitative and qualitative data analyses.

Quantitative analysis. Quantitative data analyzed included student learning outcomes (e.g., quizzes, projects, summative tests) and three waves of surveys. A pre-survey measured baseline cognitive load (i.e., intrinsic, extraneous, and germane load) (Leppink et al., 2013), initial AI literacy (i.e., awareness, usage, evaluation, ethics) (Wang et al., 2023), and collected demographic information and prior academic performance, detailed illustration can be found in Appendix A.1. After course project 1, the first post-survey re-assessed cognitive load and AI literacy in both groups, while capturing chatbot usage frequency, perceived usefulness, and patterns of interaction for the experimental group. The control group’s posttest focused instead on traditional learning resources utilized (e.g., textbooks,

notes, peers). The second post-survey, conducted after Project 2, followed the same structure to assess sustained impacts over time. The complete surveys are elaborated in Appendix A.2.

Qualitative analysis. Follow-up semi-structured interviews are conducted with fifteen purposefully sampled chatbot users, representing varied usage levels and perceived usefulness, as well as undergraduate and graduate perspectives. Interviews explore chatbot interaction patterns, perceived impacts on cognitive load, learning strategies, and students' broader attitudes toward AI in education. Qualitative data will be analyzed via thematic coding (Braun and Clarke, 2006) to enrich and contextualize survey findings.

Data analysis. For instrument reliability, we used previously validated scales: the Cognitive Load scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .82-.92$ (Leppink et al., 2013), and the Artificial Intelligence Literacy Scale (AILS, Cronbach's $\alpha = .76-.87$ (Wang et al., 2023)). Data analysis includes an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to compare student learning outcomes between groups, controlling for pre-survey scores, and a multiple regression analysis to examine how cognitive load, AI literacy, and chatbot usage predict learning outcomes.

4.3.1 Impact for Education

These quantitative outcomes and qualitative insights offer practical implications for designing AI-supported educational interventions. Unlike general-purpose AI tools, CyberBOT's close alignment with course-specific learning objectives potentially reduces students' extraneous load and increases germane load (Sweller, 1988), enabling deeper conceptual engagement and improved problem-solving. The evaluation draws insights from the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis et al., 1989), highlighting the importance of students' perceived usefulness and frequency of chatbot use for successful technology integration.

5 Related Work

AI systems for cybersecurity education. Recent studies have emphasized the importance of AI-driven tools in facilitating inquiry-based learning in cybersecurity education (Grover et al., 2023; Weikocsis et al., 2023; Ferrari et al., 2024). Among such tools, knowledge graphs and ontologies have been used to structure domain knowledge and support educational applications (Deng et al., 2021b,a).

Agrawal et al. (Agrawal, 2023; Agrawal et al., 2022) introduced AISecKG, a cybersecurity ontology designed to support intelligent tutoring and educational knowledge modeling. Subsequently, the CyberQ dataset (Agrawal et al., 2024b) was constructed using AISecKG to generate high-quality QA pairs via Ontology-based LLM prompting.

Domain-specific retrieval-augmented generation. In educational settings, RAG enables systems to provide contextually relevant and curriculum-aligned responses (Dakshit, 2024; Liu et al., 2024; Modran et al., 2024). For instance, RAG has retrieved textbook sections or course notes to support complex student queries (Alawwad et al., 2025; Castleman and Turkcan, 2023). Despite these advances, when retrieval fails to provide comprehensive or unambiguous context, LLMs may still hallucinate facts or generate inconsistent answers (Elmessiry and Elmessiry, 2024; Li et al., 2024; Agrawal et al., 2024a).

Ontology-grounded answer validation. Prior work has explored using knowledge graphs and ontologies to improve consistency (Hussien et al., 2024; De Santis et al., 2024), with ontologies modeling domain-specific rules for verifying generated responses (Majeed et al., 2025). While ontology-based methods have shown promise in tasks like automated grading and question generation (Majeed et al., 2025), they are often used statically and not integrated into the response generation process.

6 Conclusion

We present CyberBOT, an ontology-grounded RAG assistant designed to support reliable and context-aware cybersecurity education. CyberBOT leverages an intent interpreter to capture the educational dialogue context and employs an ontology verifier to ground generated responses in domain-specific rules and constraints. The system has been deployed in CSE 546: Cloud Computing, serving over one hundred graduate students. Comprehensive evaluations in a controlled lab setting, along with preliminary field surveys, highlight CyberBOT's reliability and effectiveness. This work not only demonstrates the potential of specialized NLP systems in education but also opens new avenues for advancing ontology-guided approaches in cybersecurity learning. Future work will focus on enhancing the system with personalized learning capabilities tailored to individual users.

Limitations

While CyberBOT demonstrates promise in improving factual grounding for cybersecurity education, several limitations merit discussion. (I) First, the system’s accuracy depends on the quality and coverage of its curated knowledge base and ontology. Incomplete or outdated resources could lead to gaps in domain coverage, especially as cybersecurity threats and best practices evolve rapidly. (II) Second, the current deployment focuses on a single graduate-level course with a limited sample size; thus, findings may not generalize to diverse educational settings or other technical domains. (III) Third, the ontology-based validation primarily checks compliance with known concepts and relationships, leaving truly novel or emergent cybersecurity issues outside its purview. (IV) Finally, the computational overhead of real-time retrieval and validation, especially for large-scale student cohorts, poses practical challenges for broader adoption. Future work should address these gaps by continuously updating the ontology, exploring more robust approaches for out-of-scope queries, and developing resource-efficient deployment solutions.

Ethical Considerations

Our deployment of CyberBOT for cybersecurity education carries both pedagogical benefits and important ethical responsibilities. (I) Firstly, privacy and data protection are paramount: although we store user queries and responses to facilitate personalized learning, all identifying information is anonymized and handled in accordance with institutional privacy guidelines. (II) Secondly, informed consent is integral to data collection; students are clearly notified about data usage and have the option to opt out of analytics where feasible. (III) Thirdly, bias and fairness must be considered, as large language models can inadvertently reinforce stereotypes or produce biased content. We employ continuous monitoring and prompt engineering to minimize such risks, though eliminating them entirely remains challenging. (IV) Fourthly, misuse prevention is essential in a high-stakes domain like cybersecurity. While CyberBOT focuses on defending against threats and promoting safe practices, it could inadvertently reveal vulnerabilities or unsafe tips if misapplied. We mitigate these risks through ontology-based validation and guardrails that flag or reject potentially harmful or misleading outputs. (V) Finally, academic integrity is upheld by main-

taining clear course policies on AI-assisted work. The proposed CyberBOT system is intended to supplement, not replace, student effort.

References

- Garima Agrawal. 2023. Aiseckg: Knowledge graph dataset for cybersecurity education. *AAAI-MAKE 2023: Challenges Requiring the Combination of Machine Learning 2023*.
- Garima Agrawal, Yuli Deng, Jongchan Park, Huan Liu, and Ying-Chih Chen. 2022. Building knowledge graphs from unstructured texts: Applications and impact analyses in cybersecurity education. *Information*, 13(11):526.
- Garima Agrawal, Tharindu Kumarage, Zeyad Alghamdi, and Huan Liu. 2024a. Mindful-rag: A study of points of failure in retrieval augmented generation. *CoRR*, abs/2407.12216.
- Garima Agrawal, Kuntal Pal, Yuli Deng, Huan Liu, and Ying-Chih Chen. 2024b. Cyberq: Generating questions and answers for cybersecurity education using knowledge graph-augmented llms. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 23164–23172.
- Hessa A Alawwad, Areej Alhothali, Usman Naseem, Ali Alkhatlan, and Amani Jamal. 2025. Enhancing textual textbook question answering with large language models and retrieval augmented generation. *Pattern Recognition*, 162:111332.
- Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*, pages 65–72.
- Scott Barnett, Stefanus Kurniawan, Srikanth Thudumu, Zach Brannelly, and Mohamed Abdelrazek. 2024. Seven failure points when engineering a retrieval augmented generation system. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 3rd International Conference on AI Engineering-Software Engineering for AI*, pages 194–199.
- Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2):77–101.
- Blake Castleman and Mehmet Kerem Turkcan. 2023. Examining the influence of varied levels of domain knowledge base inclusion in gpt-based intelligent tutors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12367*.
- Sagnik Dakshit. 2024. Faculty perspectives on the potential of rag in computer science higher education. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01462*.

- Ibtihaj El Dandachi. 2024. Ai-powered personalized learning: Toward sustainable education. In *Navigating the intersection of business, sustainability and technology*, pages 109–118. Springer.
- Fred D Davis et al. 1989. Technology acceptance model: Tam. *Al-Suqri, MN, Al-Aufi, AS: Information Seeking Behavior and Technology Adoption*, 205(219):5.
- Antonio De Santis, Marco Balduini, Federico De Santis, Andrea Proia, Arsenio Leo, Marco Brambilla, and Emanuele Della Valle. 2024. Integrating large language models and knowledge graphs for extraction and validation of textual test data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01700*.
- Yuli Deng, Zhen Zeng, and Dijiang Huang. 2021a. Neocyberkg: Enhancing cybersecurity laboratories with a machine learning-enabled knowledge graph. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education V. 1*, pages 310–316.
- Yuli Deng, Zhen Zeng, Kritshekhar Jha, and Dijiang Huang. 2021b. Problem-based cybersecurity lab with knowledge graph as guidance. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Technology*.
- Adel Elmessiry and Magdi Elmessiry. 2024. Navigating the evolution of artificial intelligence: Towards education-specific retrieval augmented generative ai (es-rag-ai). In *INTED2024 Proceedings*, pages 7692–7697. IATED.
- Shahul Es, Jithin James, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Steven Schockaert. 2024. Ragas: Automated evaluation of retrieval augmented generation. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 150–158.
- Elisa Pinheiro Ferrari, Albert Wong, and Youry Khmelevsky. 2024. Cybersecurity education within a computing science program—a literature review. In *Proceedings of the 26th Western Canadian Conference on Computing Education*, pages 1–5.
- Sukhpal Singh Gill, Minxian Xu, Panos Patros, Huaming Wu, Rupinder Kaur, Kamalpreet Kaur, Stephanie Fuller, Manmeet Singh, Priyansh Arora, Ajith Kumar Parlikad, et al. 2024. Transformative effects of chatgpt on modern education: Emerging era of ai chatbots. *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems*, 4:19–23.
- Shuchi Grover, Brian Broll, and Derek Babb. 2023. Cybersecurity education in the age of ai: Integrating ai learning into cybersecurity high school curricula. In *Proceedings of the 54th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1*, pages 980–986.
- Mohamed Manzour Hussien, Angie Nataly Melo, Augusto Luis Ballardini, Carlota Salinas Maldonado, Rubén Izquierdo, and Miguel Ángel Sotelo. 2024. Rag-based explainable prediction of road users behaviors for automated driving using knowledge graphs and large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00449*.
- Bohan Jiang, Chengshuai Zhao, Zhen Tan, and Huan Liu. 2024. Catching chameleons: Detecting evolving disinformation generated using large language models. In *2024 IEEE 6th International Conference on Cognitive Machine Intelligence (CogMI)*, pages 197–206. IEEE.
- Jimmie Leppink, Fred Paas, Cees PM Van der Vleuten, Tamara Van Gog, and Jeroen JG Van Merriënboer. 2013. Development of an instrument for measuring different types of cognitive load. *Behavior research methods*, 45:1058–1072.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:9459–9474.
- Xinze Li, Ming Liu, and Shang Gao. 2024. Grammar: Grounded and modular evaluation of domain-specific retrieval-augmented language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19232*.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Chang Liu, Loc Hoang, Andrew Stolman, and Bo Wu. 2024. Hita: A rag-based educational platform that centers educators in the instructional loop. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*, pages 405–412. Springer.
- Huda Lafta Majeed, Esraa Saleh Alomari, Ali Nafea Yousif, Oday Ali Hassen, Saad M Darwish, and Yu Yu Gromov. 2025. Type-2 neutrosophic ontology for automated essays scoring in cybersecurity education. *Journal of Cybersecurity & Information Management*, 15(2).
- Nicholas Metropolis and Stanislaw Ulam. 1949. The monte carlo method. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 44(247):335–341.
- Horia Modran, Ioana Corina Bogdan, Doru Ursuțiu, Cornel Samoila, and Paul Livius Modran. 2024. Llm intelligent agent tutoring in higher education courses using a rag approach. *Preprints 2024*, 2024070519.
- John Sweller. 1988. Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive science*, 12(2):257–285.
- Zhen Tan, Chengshuai Zhao, Raha Moraffah, Yifan Li, Yu Kong, Tianlong Chen, and Huan Liu. 2024a. The wolf within: Covert injection of malice into mllm societies via an mllm operative. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14859*.

- Zhen Tan, Chengshuai Zhao, Raha Moraffah, Yifan Li, Song Wang, Jundong Li, Tianlong Chen, and Huan Liu. 2024b. " glue pizza and eat rocks"—exploiting vulnerabilities in retrieval-augmented generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19417*.
- William J Triplett. 2023. Addressing cybersecurity challenges in education. *International Journal of STEM Education for Sustainability*, 3(1):47–67.
- Bingcheng Wang, Pei-Luen Patrick Rau, and Tianyi Yuan. 2023. Measuring user competence in using artificial intelligence: validity and reliability of artificial intelligence literacy scale. *Behaviour & information technology*, 42(9):1324–1337.
- Jin Wei-Kocsis, Moein Sabounchi, Gihan J Mendis, Praveen Fernando, Baijian Yang, and Tonglin Zhang. 2023. Cybersecurity education in the age of artificial intelligence: A novel proactive and collaborative learning paradigm. *IEEE Transactions on Education*.
- Roop Kumar Yekollu, Tejal Bhimraj Ghuge, Sammip Sunil Biradar, Shivkumar V Haldikar, and Omer Farook Mohideen Abdul Kader. 2024. Ai-driven personalized learning paths: Enhancing education through adaptive systems. In *International Conference on Smart data intelligence*, pages 507–517. Springer.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. [Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Chengshuai Zhao, Garima Agrawal, Tharindu Kumarage, Zhen Tan, Yuli Deng, Ying-Chih Chen, and Huan Liu. 2024. Ontology-aware rag for improved question-answering in cybersecurity education. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14191*.
- Chengshuai Zhao, Zhen Tan, Chau-Wai Wong, Xinyan Zhao, Tianlong Chen, and Huan Liu. 2025. Scale: Towards collaborative content analysis in social science with large language model agents and human intervention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.10937*.
- Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, J Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. 2023. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043*.

A Details for Human Evaluation

A.1 Explanation of Education Metric

The evaluation metrics for this study incorporate two robust and validated scales: the Cognitive Load Questionnaire (Leppink et al., 2013) and the Artificial Intelligence Literacy Scale (AILS) (Sweller, 1988; Leppink et al., 2013), captures three distinct dimensions: intrinsic, extraneous, and germane load. Intrinsic load pertains to the inherent complexity of the course content as perceived by the learners, influenced by their existing knowledge (Leppink et al., 2013). Extraneous load reflects the cognitive effort imposed by instructional features that do not directly facilitate learning, often due to unclear or ineffective presentation (Leppink et al., 2013). Germane load represents the cognitive resources devoted to meaningful learning activities, contributing to deeper understanding and schema acquisition (Leppink et al., 2013).

The AI Literacy Scale assesses students' competence and comfort in interacting with AI technologies through four subconstructs: awareness, usage, evaluation, and ethics (Wang et al., 2023). Awareness involves recognizing and understanding AI technologies, while usage measures the practical ability to effectively operate AI applications (Wang et al., 2023). Evaluation assesses the critical capacity to analyze AI tools and their outcomes, and ethics gauges the awareness of ethical responsibilities, privacy, and risks associated with AI use (Wang et al., 2023).

These metrics together provide a comprehensive evaluation framework, enabling analysis of how CyberBOT impacts both cognitive load and AI literacy among students, thereby offering insights into its effectiveness in enhancing learning outcomes within a STEM-focused educational context.

A.2 Illustrative of Survey

To ensure transparency and facilitate replicability, we provide below the public links to the posttest surveys used in our quasi-experimental design. Participants in the *experiment group* completed two surveys two specific course milestones, while a *control group* completed parallel versions. Each survey collects data on cognitive load, AI literacy, and various measures of user experience or reliance on conventional resources. All personal or identifying data have been removed or masked in these public versions to protect participant privacy. The survey for each group at each project is provided:

- Posttest 1 (Experiment Group): [Link](#)
- Posttest 1 (Control Group): [Link](#)
- Posttest 2 (Experiment Group): [Link](#)
- Posttest 2 (Control Group): [Link](#)

These instruments, adapted from established scales on cognitive load (Leppink et al., 2013) and AI literacy (Wang et al., 2023), also include course-specific items that gauge student perspectives on CyberBOT usage or standard (non-AI) learning resources. Aggregated results and analyses will be shared in a future publication to further illuminate the system's pedagogical impact.

A.3 Qualitative Interview

We design the following interview questions to qualitatively evaluate CyberBOT:

- Can you walk me through how you used CyberBOT while working on course Project 1 or Project 2?
- What kinds of questions did you typically ask the chatbot? What were you hoping to get out of those interactions?
- Did the chatbot's responses usually help you? Can you recall a time when it was especially helpful, or not very helpful?
- Did using the chatbot change how confident you felt while working on the project? Why or why not?
- How did using the chatbot affect how mentally demanding the project felt?
- Compared to other tools or resources (like lecture notes, classmates, or online forums), how did CyberBOT fit into your learning strategy?
- What do you think are the strengths and limitations of using a course-trained chatbot for learning?
- Do you have any concerns about using AI tools like this in a learning environment?

B System Screenshot and Examples

Below, we present a live instance of our CyberBOT system, showcasing its complete setup, user interface, and representative learning logs, as illustrated in Figure 4. This example highlights the end-to-end workflow and how the proposed system supports real-time interaction for cybersecurity learning.

1 Quick Web App Setup

Setup Instructions

- Clone the Repo

```
git clone https://github.com/rccrdmr/CyberBOT.git
cd CyberBOT
```
- Set Up Environment

```
python -m venv venv
source venv/bin/activate
pip install -r requirements.txt
```
- Add Together API Key

```
export TOGETHER_API_KEY="your-api-key-here"
```
- Embed QA Dataset

```
python qapair-embedder.py
```
- Run Backend

```
cd backend
uvicorn api:app --reload
```
- Run Frontend

```
cd frontend
streamlit run main.py
```

2 Web UI

3 Learning Logs

Responses

```
curl -X 'GET' \
  'http://10.218.109.39:8000/questions/14' \
  -H 'accept: application/json'
```

Request URL

```
http://10.218.109.39:8000/questions/14
```

Server response

Code	Details
200	<pre>Response body { "id": 140, "question": "What is XSS", "answer": "Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) is a web vulnerability where attackers inject malicious scripts into web pages viewed by other users, potentially leading to session hijacking, data theft, or browser-based attacks.", "validation_result": "Pass", "confidence_score": 0.9 }, "id": 141, "question": "Could you please elaborate ?", "answer": "Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) is a web vulnerability where attackers inject malicious scripts into web pages viewed by other users. Attackers exploit this by tricking users into executing the injected scripts, which can lead to the theft of sensitive information, session hijacking, or browser-based attacks. However, the provided document does not specify the types of attacks, common vulnerabilities, or prevention methods. Based on general knowledge, XSS attacks can be categorized into stored XSS, reflected XSS, and DOM-based XSS. Common vulnerabilities that lead to XSS include poor input validation, inadequate output encoding, and insufficient security measures. To prevent or mitigate XSS, methods such as input validation, output encoding, and Content Security Policy (CSP) implementation can be employed.", "validation_result": "Pass", "confidence_score": 0.9 }, "id": 142, "question": "What is the most beautiful place on earth ?", "answer": "\u26a0 This answer could not be validated against the ontology. Please refine your question.", "validation_result": "Not Pass", "confidence_score": 0 } Response headers content-length: 1460 content-type: application/json date: Sat, 29 Mar 2025 10:12:31 GMT server: uvicorn</pre>

Figure 4: A live running example of CyberBOT system. (1) The quick web app Setup section provides a complete step-by-step deployment guide, including cloning the repository, setting up the environment, configuring the API key, and running the backend and frontend services. (2) The web UI section showcases the login/signup interface and user dashboard, allowing personalized access and interaction. (3) The system records and displays the user's learning history, including follow-up questions and ontology-based answer validation. (4) The learning logs demonstrate backend validation of QA pairs with pass/fail results, confidence scores, and ontology-aligned reasoning

C Illustrative of Prompt

We provide here the core prompts that guide CyberBOT's functionality, including prompts of the intent interpreter, the LLM, and the ontology verifier. These prompts serve as the backbone for transforming raw user queries into validated, domain-specific responses within the cybersecurity context.

C.1 Prompt of Intent Interpreter

Before the system retrieves relevant documents, the intent interpreter prompt helps discern the user's underlying goals or question types. By examining the conversation history, this prompt rewrites or augments queries to align them with the structured format required for multi-round retrieval. Below, we present the specific instructions that the intent interpreter relies upon to carry out this task.

Intent Interpreter Prompt

```
You are an assistant that rewrites vague or follow-up user questions based on previous conversation history. Given the chat history and current question, rewrite the question to make it fully self-contained, specific, and intent-aware.
```

```
CHAT HISTORY:  
{memory}
```

```
CURRENT QUESTION:  
{current_question}
```

```
REWRITTEN QUESTION:
```

C.2 Prompt of Large Language Model

After the user's intent is clarified and relevant contextual documents are retrieved, the large language model prompt orchestrates the actual generation of answers. It fuses the rewritten query, selected context, and any additional instructions to produce coherent, domain-focused responses. The following excerpt outlines the instructions that drive our LLM-based generation process.

Large Language Model Prompt

```
DOCUMENT:  
document
```

```
QUESTION:  
question
```

```
INSTRUCTIONS:  
Answer the user's QUESTION using the DOCUMENT text above.  
Keep your answer grounded in the facts of the DOCUMENT.  
If the DOCUMENT does not contain the facts to answer the QUESTION,  
give a response based on your knowledge.
```

```
Answer concisely and factually without extra commentary:
```

C.3 Prompt of Ontology Verifier

Once the model yields a tentative answer, the ontology verifier prompt is responsible for checking whether the response adheres to the cybersecurity-specific ontology. This involves confirming that crucial domain rules, relations, and constraints are not violated. Below is an illustration of how we guide the ontology verifier to perform its validation.

Ontology Verifier Prompt

```
Your task is to evaluate whether the ANSWER correctly aligns with the ONTOLOGY provided below.
```

```
Return ONLY a JSON response in the format:  
{
```

```
"validation_result": "Pass" or "Not Pass",
"confidence_score": CONFIDENCE_SCORE_HERE (between 0 and 1),
"reasoning": "A brief explanation of why the answer is valid or not."
}
```

DO NOT include anything outside of this JSON structure.

Here are a few examples:

Example 1 (Cybersecurity - Valid Answer, High Confidence):

QUESTION: What is a vulnerability in cybersecurity?

ANSWER: A vulnerability is a weakness in a system that can be exploited by an attacker.

EXPECTED VALIDATION RESPONSE:

```
{
"validation_result": "Pass",
"confidence_score": 0.95,
"reasoning": "Answer maps to 'system, can_expose, vulnerability' and 'attacker, can_exploit, vulnerability'."
}
```

Example 2 (Cloud Computing - Valid Answer, High Confidence):

QUESTION: What is virtualization in cloud computing?

ANSWER: Virtualization is a technique that allows multiple virtual machines to run on a single physical system.

EXPECTED VALIDATION RESPONSE:

```
{
"validation_result": "Pass",
"confidence_score": 0.92,
"reasoning": "Answer maps to 'Concept/technique = Virtualization' in cloud computing ontology."
}
```

Example 3 (Cybersecurity - Valid Answer, Medium-High Confidence):

QUESTION: What tool can be used to analyze vulnerabilities?

ANSWER: A logging tool.

EXPECTED VALIDATION RESPONSE:

```
{
"validation_result": "Pass",
"confidence_score": 0.68,
"reasoning": "Although brief, the answer is grounded in concepts like 'tool' and 'can_analyze vulnerability'."
}
```

Example 4 (Cloud Computing - Valid Answer, Medium-High Confidence):

QUESTION: What techniques are used for load distribution in cloud computing?

ANSWER: Load balancing and auto-scaling are common techniques.

EXPECTED VALIDATION RESPONSE:

```
{
"validation_result": "Pass",
"confidence_score": 0.7,
"reasoning": "Answer correctly reflects cloud computing techniques from the ontology."
}
```

Example 5 (Cybersecurity - Vague Answer, Low Confidence):

QUESTION: What are security techniques in cybersecurity?

ANSWER: Techniques are used to protect systems.

EXPECTED VALIDATION RESPONSE:

```
{
"validation_result": "Not Pass",
"confidence_score": 0.4,
"reasoning": "Answer is too vague and not grounded in specific ontology concepts like 'Risk Assessment' or 'HoneyPot'."
}
```

Example 6 (Cloud Computing - Vague Answer, Low Confidence):

QUESTION: What are characteristics of cloud computing?

ANSWER: Cloud computing has many features.

EXPECTED VALIDATION RESPONSE:

```
{
  "validation_result": "Not Pass",
  "confidence_score": 0.35,
  "reasoning": "Answer is too vague and does not mention ontology-grounded concepts like
'on-demand self-service' or 'resource pooling'."
}
```

Example 7 (Neither - Irrelevant Answer, Zero Confidence):

QUESTION: What is the capital of France?

ANSWER: Paris is the capital of France.

EXPECTED VALIDATION RESPONSE:

```
{
  "validation_result": "Not Pass",
  "confidence_score": 0.0,
  "reasoning": "Answer is factually correct but completely unrelated to cybersecurity or
cloud computing ontology."
}
```

Now evaluate the actual input below:

QUESTION:
{question}

ANSWER:
{answer}

ONTOLOGY:
{ontology_text}