



VOLUNTEERS IN CORRECTION— The South Australian Experience

** by R.M. Durant and Mary T. McCarthy*

** R.M. Durant, Dip.Soc.Stud., Assistant Director, Probation and Parole.
Dept. of Correctional Services S.A.*

** Mary T. McCarthy, Ass.Dip.S.W., Assistant Senior Probation and
Parole Officer (Volunteers). Dept. of Correctional Services S.A.*

INTRODUCTION

The field of adult corrections is one that to date has remained mysterious to the community, notwithstanding the plethora of crime orientated programmes available on the electronic media. This may be one of the factors, among many, that contribute to the extreme reactions of vocal members of the community to reported fluctuations in crime levels, and perceived changes to court penalties.

In the case of our own Department, little of our activities is known to the general community; most of the publicity centres around incidents such as escapes, and it is probably true that the few concepts many have would be more appropriate to the American situation. There are, obviously, a number of ways in which the community might have access to greater knowledge of the adult corrections area; one such way is to develop a volunteer programme to enable citizen participation in corrections. That is one of the two major reasons for establishing volunteers in the South Australian Department of Correctional Services.

For a majority of offenders who come under the care of this Department, on probation, in prison or on parole, the intervention is not sought by the offender but is imposed by a Court or Parole Board. It is, therefore, hardly surprising that the intervention is often resented, and the efforts by

individual staff, either custodial or professional, may not be as effective as we would wish, no matter how competent the operator. This is not to deny the real achievements made in developing workable relationships between staff and offender, but there are significant numbers of offenders dealt with, especially in the probation and parole area who are difficult to reach, and for whom the perception of authority attached to professional staff forms an insurmountable barrier. The acceptance of this limitation and the recognition that a volunteer may well succeed in reaching such offenders, is the second reason for the development of a volunteer scheme.

What is not envisaged is any diminution in the responsibilities of statutory staff in relation to supervision. Volunteers are seen to be an additional resource, not a replacement. That is why we do not see the need for extensive volunteer training, but rather to discover the existing skills and personal resources the volunteer possesses, and to use them appropriately. Volunteers are used to meet specific client needs with existing personal resources, and when that need is met, to be withdrawn from that case and utilized elsewhere. This provides for flexibility in the use of resources and widens the scope of activities in which volunteers may participate.

In summary, the development of a volunteer scheme provides a chance for citizen participation in the corrections area,

which in turn educates an increasing proportion of the community to our goals and programmes, hopefully gaining wider support for such aims. The use of concerned and caring volunteers provides greater opportunity to reach offenders and develop more useful intervention programmes, thus providing a more effective and efficient field service.

By encouraging citizen participation, the problems of corrections and the strategies devised to solve them may become accepted by a greater section of the community. Crime and control are community problems; it is time that the community took a greater part and not put it to one side to be dealt with by professionals only.

However, it must be recognized that higher levels of citizen participation make us more open to scrutiny and critical examination. As the holders of power over numbers of offenders, an increase in scrutiny reduces the chances of abuse. In the long term, expanded volunteer participation has positive benefits to not only the clients, in protecting their interest, but to the Department as a method of influencing public opinion in favour of our policies.

This article described the development of the volunteer scheme in the South Australian Department of Correctional Services, from the first stirring of the idea, through the preliminary planning as we attempted to anticipate problems and propose strategies to overcome them, the first rather tentative start and the eventual model that emerged, so that other groups already working with volunteers, or contemplating their use might use this paper as a basis for discussion and comparison and so avoid some of our mistakes.

EARLY DISCUSSIONS

A serious discussion on volunteerism in the Probation and Parole Branch took place in the latter part of 1973, following the visit to Australia of Dr. Ivan Scheier, Director of the National Information Centre on Volunteerism, Colorado U.S.A. : a guest speaker to the Seventh Biennial Conference of the Australian Crime Prevention Council held in Melbourne. Dr. Scheier came to South Australia from the Conference and was able to talk with those staff who were interested. The reactions resulting from that meeting were mixed, but a small group had sufficient interest to continue discussions and pursue the ideas generated.

Midway through 1974 a seminar on volunteers was held at which all probation and parole officers participated, to provide a more accurate test of feeling towards introducing a scheme, as by this time a small group of us were convinced that volunteers were a necessary support to our work. The seminar illustrated the diversity of opinion within the 50 or so staff. Some saw volunteers as a threat to their own position, and either opposed their introduction, or at best saw such limited use as to render them impotent. Others saw volunteers in terms of practical expertise only; a form of consultant such as financial or legal counsellor. The remainder, probably about ten staff were converted to the Scheier type of volunteer scheme and could see a diversity of roles.

Groups at the seminar were asked to assume some forms of volunteerism and to consider recruitment and utilisation. One suggestion was to use existing voluntary agencies as a source, if not the only source of volunteers. Ex-offenders were seen as another source of volunteers, a suggestion that won wide support but with the proviso that it be because of individual qualities, not simply for the ex-offender status. Concern was expressed at recruiting "do-gooders" with inappropriate motivation who might be a disruptive influence. There was also a concern that volunteerism could cause a division of attitude in clients, that would prove detrimental to the worker/client relationship. Co-ordination of any scheme was seen as

the function of the Senior Probation and Parole Officers in the District Offices. A limited orientation level of training was also seen to be necessary.

Most officers agreed that volunteers would not reduce the workload, but some conceded that despite such a situation volunteers might improve the service to agency clients. A majority of staff appeared to accept that volunteers could have a positive public relations and community education value. The latter two concessions were sufficient to encourage the management to continue facilitating discussions on volunteerism and push for a definite proposal. A small group of staff, including senior management continued to meet and work out a plan for volunteers. Ideas generated at the meetings were fed back to the Branch. This in turn produced further ideas and recruited one or two more converts, but also produced concern and speculation of a most negative kind. To counteract this, in November 1974 a list of points for a model scheme was circulated, that was a senior management proposal, and comments and criticism were invited.

The points listed included —

1. That the First Report of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee¹ had recommended the use of volunteers, which suggested their eventual inevitable introduction, so that a system of our design was preferable.
2. It was not seen as a time saving device but as providing for new forms of relationships to enhance our professional work, thus providing a better service.
3. Volunteerism should utilise the existing skills of volunteers, and provide them with the opportunity as citizens, to participate and take some responsibility for the corrections system.
4. No staff member would be forced to work with volunteers, although management reserved the right to propagandise their advantages.
5. Volunteers should be just that, and not given any statutory rights or responsibilities, although they might be granted some out of pocket expenses.
6. Volunteers should not be a threat to existing staff, or staff recruitment. It is "us" who are granting "them" an opportunity to share in the work, and retain the privilege to withdraw the opportunity.
7. One officer would be given a co-ordinating responsibility for screening and training, but that the scheme should be locally based in District Offices, the Co-ordinator liaising with screening and training, the local Senior Probation and Parole Officer controlling the scheme, and the volunteer in face to face contact with a client having a direct responsibility to the Probation and Parole Officer responsible for that client.

Following upon the issue of this discussion paper, in April 1975 a meeting was called for all those staff who might support the introduction of a volunteer scheme. The notice of the meeting contained a list of discussion points for consideration, including two types of volunteer schemes. One was to use volunteers to develop relationships with clients, use their existing skills to meet needs, and use the statutory officer as a resource person when the volunteer needed additional skills. The statutory officer would retain overall authority, especially for matters such as breach proceedings. The second type was a scheme in which volunteers were used more as practical resource people with the casework role remaining entirely with the statutory officer. In this scheme, volunteers might also be used in non-social work aspects of the Department's work.

RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING

Approximately one quarter of the staff of the Branch attended that meeting generating sufficient enthusiasm to take the plunge, and so the decision was made to start the scheme from July 1975, based upon the model using volunteers to develop relationships, use existing skills and with overall authority remaining with the statutory officer. Official Ministerial approval was then obtained, enabling the formalities of insurance, compensation and out of pocket expenses for vehicle use or travel costs to be arranged. Extensive debate upon how the first recruitments would be made was resolved by the simple expedient of persuading two individuals already well known to several officers to be the inaugural recruits. Within a short time three or four more individuals joined the scheme and at least three District Offices each had one or two volunteers attached to them.

The need for overall supervision of the scheme had been recognised from earliest discussion, and in agreement with staff and the Branch, one base-grade officer volunteered herself to co-ordinate the scheme, and went onto a part caseload to compensate. Recruitment continued, and has done ever since with one exception mentioned later, to be by word of mouth from volunteer to volunteer, or from probation and parole officer to volunteer. The basic procedure has been for the initial referral to be passed on to the Co-ordinator, who contacts the potential volunteer and sends out a personal profile form to be completed and returned, or the form has been sent out, completed and returned by the Senior Probation and Parole Officer. This is followed by an interview with the Co-ordinator, and sometimes with the local Senior Probation and Parole Officer as a joint interview before acceptance into the scheme. The original proposal put no ban upon ex-offenders; the only prerequisite was that they were free of obligation to the Department, and were selected for their personal qualities, not their status. As a support to the Co-ordinator, all ex-offender volunteers are jointly interviewed by the Co-ordinator and the Assistant Director before acceptance.

With a growth in numbers, the problem of training was faced, and an orientation or preparation programme was devised. It consisted of three evening sessions, each of about two hours, using a combination of descriptive lectures, demonstration role-plays, case studies and subsequent group discussion. A manual for volunteers was produced, which provides basic information on the Department, Branch and system in general, and forms part of the background information in the training programme. This training technique has proved to be most satisfactory, and has only been supplemented when volunteers were specifically recruited for specific projects. It is important not to overload the initial training, and if recruitment policy is adhered to, not essential. The proviso being that as volunteers gain confidence and experience, some will wish to improve their skills and it is necessary to plan for this.

VOLUNTEER USAGE

The majority of volunteers are used in face to face situations with probationers, parolees and their families, generally to fulfil a specific purpose, based upon the needs of the offender and the skills of the volunteer. The duration of the contact is flexible and may involve befriending and supporting clients on either a long or short term basis, interpreting, counselling and training particular areas, visiting long term prisoners or assisting in finding accommodation and employment. In addition a growing number of volunteers work at the "Hub", a day project centre run by the Department for some of our most disadvantaged clients.

These volunteers assist in the area of interpersonal skills training and some teach practical and leisure activities. Another group of fourteen specially trained volunteers staff an Information Centre in the Adelaide Magistrates Court. This group offers help, support and advice on most facets of the criminal justice system and related welfare areas, to people appearing in court, to their families and to the public in general. It is a free service financed by the Department and is offered as a community resource. Although still in its infancy the response to this project has been very encouraging, the Centre's volunteers dealt with over 300 inquiries in the first five weeks of operation. It is hoped that the development of this project will be documented in due course. This latter project was the first occasion for specific advertisement by the Department for volunteers, and produced a very satisfactory response. Advertisements appeared in the major dailies, and in some local suburban papers. Promoting volunteerism for Government Departments may prove to be worthy of further study.

Day to day responsibility for volunteers is with the Senior Probation and Parole Officer in the District Office. The Co-ordinator acts as a resource person for such matters as inter-office referrals for a volunteer with particular skills. She is also responsible for vetting potential volunteers with the Senior Probation and Parole Officer, for the training of new volunteers and increasingly participating in planning special projects in which volunteers may be used. She also provides information on the scheme to management, and most importantly provides information to volunteers and staff through a volunteers newsletter.

Finally, the Co-ordinator has the responsibility of dispensing with the services of volunteers found wanting. This is a very important point, for a successful scheme can be easily wrecked by unsuitable volunteers. The Department grants the privilege of participation, that can also be withdrawn.

WHO ARE THE VOLUNTEERS?

In its report on the role of the volunteer in the social services, the Ave's Committee commented, "It still seems to be a commonly held view that the typical voluntary worker is a middle-aged, middle-class, married woman."² With the exception of age this commonly held view was found to be close to reality. The age range of volunteers was in fact very wide. Although the Ave's investigation took place in England and Wales during 1966-1969, many of its findings are relevant to the Australian volunteer situation at the present time and provide a useful basis for comparison. For present purposes we will use sections of the report as a measure of the characteristics of the average volunteer population.

Speaking in Australia in late 1973, Dr. Ivan Scheier remarked, "volunteers represent a fairly restricted type of person and background, usually in comfortable financial circumstances."³ As a means of balancing this situation Scheier advocated the recruitment of ex-offenders. Having drawn widely on overseas experience, the Mitchell Committee made a similar recommendation in its first report, thus encouraging "a wider sociological selection of workers."⁴ Subsequently the recruitment of selected ex-offenders became an integral part of the Department's volunteer programme.

Who are the volunteers in Correctional Services, S.A.?

What influence does involvement in a correctional system have upon individual volunteers? The following tables and commentary are an attempt to answer these questions. The data was obtained from self-profiles completed by volunteers at the time of recruitment and from a subsequent questionnaire. The period studied dates from the introduction of volunteers into the Department in mid-1975 until September

1977. The total number of prospective volunteers referred was seventy-four, recruitment was entirely by word of mouth and of this number fifty-six individuals were registered as volunteers.

TABLE 1

AGE AND SEX OF VOLUNTEERS IN CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, S.A.

(numerical distribution)

AGE	MALE	FEMALE
18 to 25	8	6
26 to 35	7	9
36 to 45	6	7
46 to 65	7	6
Total = 56	28	28

It is interesting to notice in Table 1 that men and women are equally represented, and while the early middle-age to late middle-age groups are heavily represented, comprising 46.6% of the volunteer force, there is an equal distribution of men and women in these groups. What is perhaps more significant is the 26 to 35 age range which has the highest numerical representation of any single age group accounting for 28.5% of all volunteers. In a study of volunteers in thirteen hospitals Ave's found this particular group, "the age of maximum participation in child rearing and career building" to be the least represented."⁵

This contrast may suggest that younger people and men in particular are attracted more by correctional work than by the somewhat conservative activity of hospital visiting. A review of our records revealed that at no time in the two year period had middle-aged volunteers outnumbered men.

TABLE 2

EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF VOLUNTEERS IN CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, S.A.

(numerical distribution)

LEVEL	MALE	FEMALE
Lower Secondary	10	11
Upper Secondary	8	9
Specific Skill or Tertiary Training*	5	3
Graduate	2	3
Post Graduate	3	2
Total = 56	28	28

* e.g. nursing qualification, past or current undergraduate studies.

In Table 2 there is an obvious concentration of volunteers in the combined secondary education groups viz. 67.8%. The high percentage (37.5%) categorized as having a lower secondary education i.e. to third year level, contrasts markedly with the findings of the Ave's Committee which suggested that volunteers were more likely to come from the upper occupational groups and to be better educated than the average citizen.⁶ In a particular study of 114 volunteers it was found that 59% had been to universities.⁷ This contrast would appear to suggest a trend away from the middle-class bias so prevalent in traditional volunteerism.

TABLE 3

OCCUPATION OF VOLUNTEERS IN CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, S.A.

(numerical distribution)

GROUP	MALE	FEMALE
Clerk	5	5
Cleric	1	—
Home Duties	—	8
Nurse	1	1
Professional/Managerial	3	2
Retired	3	1
Student	4	2
Teacher	1	1
Skilled/manual	2	—
Unskilled/manual	6	2
Unemployed	1	3
Welfare worker	1	3
Total = 56	28	28

The occupational range for volunteers in Correctional Services, S.A., is consistent with a departure from the middle-class bias. Particularly if one accepts occupation as a broad indication of class, as the Mitchell Committee appears to have done. "It is likely that such people as school teachers, clerics, successful businessmen and housewives whose children have grown up* will provide the majority of volunteers. They will normally have middle-class backgrounds. . . this probably is derived from the experience of other jurisdictions."⁸ Taking this supposition at face value it is interesting to note that over a period of two years teachers, business people, clerics and housewives have accounted for only 27% of correctional volunteers in South Australia. Ave's also points out in the study of 114 volunteers previously mentioned that almost three quarters came from the professional and managerial classes, while only two individuals came from semi-skilled or unskilled backgrounds.⁹ Managerial and other professions, viz. nursing and teaching account for only 16% of the correctional volunteer population in South Australia, while skilled and unskilled manual workers represent 18% of the group.

*Of the eight volunteers who gave their occupation as "home duties" six had dependent children.

From its inception our volunteer programme has been aimed at recruiting members of the community from students, housewives, labourers, public servants, single parents and the unemployed to businessmen and ex-offenders. The result is a diverse group in terms of age, educational and occupational status evidencing a varied cross-section of the community. This diversity strengthens the hope that the programme will not entirely succumb to the middle-class bias mentioned previously. The continued involvement of ex-offenders who currently comprise 9% of the volunteer force will undoubtedly have an effect in this area.

THE IMPACT OF VOLUNTEERISM

The preceding data was obtained from volunteers' self-profiles, completed at the time of recruitment. Figures quoted in the following section refer only to the volunteers active at 15th April, 1977, and not to the total number recruited during the two and a quarter year period.

In early 1977 the volunteers were invited to respond to a questionnaire¹⁰ with the aim of assessing, among other things, whether involvement for a reasonable length of time in a correctional service results in positive attitude change towards

offenders. No volunteer involved in the programme for less than three months was circularized. As with most surveys not everybody responded, but those who did respond in the affirmative represented 68% of the sample and 44% of the Department's volunteer force, an insufficient sample on which to form any firm conclusions. The following comments are considered representative of the replies.

"I feel that I have more understanding of what motivates some offenders to commit crime, as most of the offenders with whom I have come in contact have come from very unfortunate backgrounds. This is not true in lots of cases of course, but it has taught me not to judge people without knowing the facts."

"I am more inclined to think that their offending is a result of their functional incapacity — e.g. emotional intellectual and social disability — in fact a collection of deprivations, and not just one simple factor which causes them to offend just for the heck of it."

"I hadn't previously considered the problems they would have, and had just ignored them through lack of contact. Now I recognise that (a) it is too late to completely "reform" some offenders, but (b) it is certainly more likely that they will be "reformed" out of gaol rather than inside."

"My previous experience with offenders was through a policeman who was my husband, now I find I can, at least in most cases, see a second side to offences."

"I used to be an offender."

As stated earlier in the sample, 68% of the volunteer group was an inadequate basis from which to draw any firm conclusions, but the indications were at least encouraging. Almost half of the volunteers have experienced what could be interpreted as positive attitude towards offenders.

It was a simple survey and miniscule in terms of numbers but nevertheless valuable in terms of the ongoing development of our volunteer programme. It provided direct feedback from individual volunteers and consolidated our belief in the potential for community involvement in correctional social work. At the present time, June 1978, almost seventy volunteers are working in various areas in the Department, which is slightly in excess of the number of statutory staff currently employed.

SOME PROBLEM AREAS

Having begun with the conviction that probation and parole would present an exciting challenge to members of the community seeking voluntary work, and at the same time benefit both clients and the Department, we are as yet undaunted. However, problems have emerged which are inherent both in our philosophy and in the administrative structure adopted. Probation Officers are encouraged rather than required to involve volunteers in appropriate cases and consequently volunteers as a casework tool are given low priority by many officers. Figures kept over a period of four months revealed that out of a total of 53 probation officers, 23 used volunteers regularly while 7 used them occasionally. No doubt the size of the case-loads and the recent proliferation of areas in which probation officers now find themselves involved, exert an influence on this situation. At the same time, the loss in terms of potential community interest which results from this moderate use of volunteers could be used to argue for a reduction in case-loads with a subsequent increase in the number of professional staff employed. Obviously this will not occur overnight, particularly in the present economic climate in which staff ceilings in most government depart-

ments are almost static, but it should be a consideration in future planning. Over-worked staff do not have the time nor the patience to utilize volunteers, and in the initial stages volunteers require a considerable amount of guidance and support. Likewise the meagre attention given to the subject of volunteers in social work courses can be seen as contributing to the low priority afforded them.

As the Ave's report points out, "The difficulty is particularly acute for those just completing their training; especially since they are likely to have found little or nothing in their training to help them accept the idea, or to influence their attitude to voluntary help."¹¹ In 1977 the South Australian Institute of Technology listed "Volunteers" among 8 options offered to students in a one semester social work unit. To our knowledge it was the only information on volunteers offered during the two year course. A partial solution may be to ensure that the subject is effectively included in the formal orientation of new staff.

Difficulties undoubtedly exist in the relationships between paid staff and volunteers. In our own experience the two groups least likely to utilize volunteers are newly qualified workers and older unqualified members of staff. One can only speculate as to the cause. It may well be that the place of "amateurs" in an area generally considered to be the responsibility of skilled workers is questioned. Or it might even be argued that the use of volunteers, for whatever reason, induces the government to decrease monies for trained personnel. And yet rather than displace professional workers, the increased use of volunteers should, if they are given adequate support and supervision, generate more paid positions. Our reasons for believing that volunteers have an important role to play in correctional social work have been clearly outlined earlier in this article. If volunteers are employed only as an extension of a professional service and in a genuine effort to involve the community in the administration of criminal justice, then an elitist stance becomes untenable. The introduction of a volunteer can, in many cases, enhance an offender's social environment. Ultimately it is to the ordinary community that the client must adapt.

The necessity for a single individual to take overall responsibility for the administration of a volunteer programme is generally taken for granted, but regardless of the number of volunteers it is not sufficient that only one person in a department or agency be employed specifically to promote the use of volunteers.¹² Such a situation is administratively cumbersome and inefficient. Rather it is necessary to provide a long term structure whereby one person in every district team or office is responsible for the co-ordination and support of local volunteers. In the Department of Correctional Services in South Australia this role has been filled by Senior Probation and Parole Officers, a situation with obvious drawbacks. Given the many supervisory duties of senior personnel, the utilization of volunteers is understandably accorded low priority. In some cases the number of volunteers exceeds the number of salaried staff. A more effective method of supervising volunteers would appear to be that adopted by the Department for Community Welfare, S.A. In each Departmental office a base-grade community welfare worker is seconded several hours per week to co-ordinate volunteers on a local level, with over-sight by a regional co-ordinatory. This approach is gradually being taken by the Department of Correctional Services, but it is our belief that this latter should be enhanced in two areas. Local co-ordinators should, in due course, be released to deal with volunteers and the community on a full-time basis. Consequently such positions

should be financially up-graded. The recruitment and supervision of volunteers can be appreciated as an area of higher risk, in terms of client protection, than that of recruiting and supervising professional staff who have the benefit of several years tertiary professional staff who have the benefit of several years tertiary training behind them.

The involvement of volunteers in the work of government departments is a relatively new and unpredictable field, and the responsibilities of those working in this area should be recognized accordingly. Such recognition would thus attract competent, enthusiastic people to the positions created. Scheier comments, "volunteer programme administration is just emerging as an exciting profession which partakes of many traditional disciplines, though it is owned by none of them."¹³ While we would not describe volunteer administration as a profession in itself, it is certainly an area that could do with a greater injection of time and money. We need to plan for a structure that will support the volunteer scheme in the next decade. Volunteers are an investment, not an economy.

NOTES

1. First Report, Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee, "Sentencing and Corrections", S.A. Govt. Printer, 1973, p.185.
2. Aves, G.M. "The Voluntary Worker in the Social Services" National Council of Social Service and National Institute for Social Work Training, U.K. 1970, p.33.
3. Scheier, I. in "Australian Crime Prevention, Correction

and After-Care Council, Proceedings of Seventh National Conference", Melbourne University, 1973, p.M6.

4. Ibid, N1 at p.185.
5. Ibid, n2 at p.35.
6. Ibid, n2 at p.34.
7. Ibid, n2 at p.34.
8. Ibid, n1 at p.185.
9. Ibid, n2 at p.34.
10. Questionnaire:
NAME NOT NECESSARY

1. Prior to becoming a volunteer with this Department, had you any experience in working with offenders?
2. Do you feel that your involvement with the Department of Correctional Services has in any way changed your attitude to offenders?
3. If so, in what way?
4. What degree of importance do you place upon members of the community being involved in rehabilitation — viz. volunteerism?

HIGH MODERATE LOW

5. What are your reasons for being a volunteer?
11. Ibid, n2 at p.171.
12. "Volunteers in Community Service," A Resource Document, Victorian Council of Social Services, 1976, p.68.
13. Scheier, I. quoted in Wilson M. "The Effective Management of Volunteer Programmes," U.S.A., 1976, p.17.



CARNIVAL CORNER

NEXT TO COLES
LOWER MALL

- Slush Drinks — 6 Varieties, 25¢ small, 35¢ medium, 45¢ large
- Jaffles — 6 Varieties, cheese and tomato, spaghetti and cheese, beef curry 65¢, ham and pineapple, asparagus and cheese, ham and cheese 70¢

Soft serve ice cream in 2 flavours, vanilla and chocolate

Granny type ice cream by the scoop, 14 flavours

Pop Corn, Fairy Floss, Doughnuts,

Pop Dogs with onion butter, cheese butter, mild or hot mustard, B.B.Q. Sauce

Try our Slush. The New Frozen Drink

COLONNADES

NOARLUNGA CENTRE
Adelaide, S.A.